

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

7845. By Mr. GARBNER of Oklahoma: Petition of the executive committee of the Hillerman Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Enid, Okla., urging support of House bill 9986 providing for Federal supervision of films to be licensed for interstate and international commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7846. By Mr. McKEOWN: Petition of the Bernard Gill Post, American Legion, State of Oklahoma, Shawnee, Okla., asking Congress to issue negotiable coupon United States bonds to pay off the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

7847. Also, memorial of H. G. Turner and other post-office employees of the Okemah (Okla.) post office requesting that House bills 3087 and 6603 be passed immediately; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

7848. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of Queensboro Federation of Mothers Clubs, favoring the passage of the Reed-Curtis bill; to the Committee on Education.

7849. By Mr. PATMAN: Petition of Thomas Chamberlain and 387 citizens and veterans of Great Falls, Mont., presented through Arthur F. Peabody, urging the immediate payment of the adjusted-service certificates now held by veterans of the World War; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7850. Also, petition of Charles H. Donnell, of Ansonia, Conn., and 100 other veterans and citizens from the State of Connecticut, presented through Arthur F. Peabody, urging the immediate payment of adjusted-service certificates now held by World War veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7851. Also, petition of Peter Wafier and 114 other veterans and citizens of Orrville, Ohio, presented through Arthur F. Peabody, urging the immediate payment of adjusted-service certificates now held by World War veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7852. By Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY: Petition of members of Burlington Chapter, No. 22, Veterans' Association, and Ladies' Auxiliary, Chapter No. 12, Beardstown, Ill., opposed to State or Government operating our waterways for commercial purposes, and opposed to trucks and busses using State-aid highways for commercial purposes, and while they use them that a heavy tax be placed upon them; that the size and tonnage of busses and trucks be regulated by law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7853. By Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin: Petition of members of Cleary Post, No. 115, American Legion, Elroy, Wis., in favor of the immediate cash payment of the adjusted compensation (bonus); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7854. Also, petition of veterans of the World War and members of the National Home, Wisconsin, in favor of the immediate cash payment of the adjusted compensation (bonus); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7855. By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH: Petition of Mrs. Gilbert T. Chapin, of Brockton, Mass., and 1,800 residents of the fourteenth Massachusetts congressional district, urging the passage of House bill 7884, for the exemption of dogs from vivisection in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 10, 1930

(Legislative day of Tuesday, December 9, 1930)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Haltigan, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10198) to repeal obsolete statutes and to improve the United States Code.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 328. An act for the relief of Edward C. Dunlap;
H. R. 1759. An act for the relief of Laura A. DePodesta;
H. R. 1825. An act for the relief of David McD. Shearer; and
H. R. 10198. An act to repeal obsolete statutes and to improve the United States Code.

SENATOR FROM KANSAS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the credentials of ARTHUR CAPPER, chosen a Senator from the State of Kansas for the term commencing March 4, 1931, which were read and ordered to be placed on file.

WITHDRAWALS AND RESTORATIONS OF PUBLIC LANDS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copy of letter of the Commissioner of the General Land Office, dated December 8, 1930, together with a report of the withdrawals and restorations of public lands as contemplated by the act approved June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 847), which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

REPORT OF BELLEAU WOOD MEMORIAL ASSOCIATION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from Elizabeth Van Rensselaer Frazer, honorary president of the Belleau Wood Memorial Association, submitting the annual report of the association, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate resolutions adopted by the Second Oregon Volunteer Infantry Association, favoring the passage of legislation which, in the event of war, would provide for the conscription of all wealth, labor, and property for the service of the Government, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also laid before the Senate resolutions of the Ministerial Alliance and its allied societies adopted at Joplin, Mo., favoring adhesion by the United States to the protocols for the World Court, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also laid before the Senate a communication in the nature of a petition from the president of the Russian Veterans' Society of the World War, Seattle, Wash., praying for the passage of legislation for the relief of Russian invalid World War veterans, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from Warren H. Richards and Stanley N. Taylor, students of the Northeast High School, Philadelphia, Pa., submitting a relief plan for the unemployment situation, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from John Wuchter, of Portland, Oreg., relative to an invention for propelling ocean vessels 25 per cent faster and lessening vibration, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from Patrick Gallagher, a citizen of New York and resident of the District of Columbia, relative to the Philippine problem and related matters, which, with the accompanying memorandum, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PROPOSED FEDERAL BUILDING AT BOONVILLE, IND.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana presented a resolution adopted by the Boonville (Ind.) Business Men's Association, which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the receipts of the post office of the city of Boonville, Ind., fall short only a small amount of the estimated \$20,000 of receipts per annum necessary to entitle us to a new Federal building; and

Whereas Boonville is a thriving city of approximately 5,000 inhabitants and the local post office serves a large and important rural community, including several small towns; and

Whereas a new Federal building would be an appropriate and fitting memorial to the memory of the Hon. James A. Hemenway, who, prior to his death, was interested in procuring a Federal building; and

Whereas the construction of a Federal building here at this time would furnish labor to the drought-stricken people in this community; and

Whereas the present rented building for the post office here is too small and crowded to afford room for efficient service, and, as we are informed, the lease thereof expires in the coming year: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Boonville Business Men's Association in their annual session on December 5, 1930, That we urgently urge and petition President Hoover, the Postmaster General, and the Congress to include a Federal building for Boonville in the list of Federal buildings to be constructed at this time, and that a copy of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of this association to Senators JAMES E. WATSON and ARTHUR R. ROBINSON and to Congressman HARRY E. ROWBOTTOM and to President Hoover and to the Postmaster General and to the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General.

Passed and adopted December 5, 1930.

LOUIS L. ROTH,

President Boonville Business Men's Association.

Attest:

ERNEST W. OWEN, Secretary.

KINGS MOUNTAIN CELEBRATION

Mr. BLEASE. Mr. President, on December 3 I had inserted in the RECORD certain remarks, together with some documents. I have received this morning from Hon. CHARLES A. JONAS, Congressman from North Carolina, a letter which I ask may be published in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., December 9, 1930.

HON. COLE L. BLEASE,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BLEASE: The first intimation I had of any misunderstanding or error on the part of the officials of the Kings Mountain celebration committee, as to your status as a member of the official committee to represent the Senate at the celebration, was contained in the matter placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by you December 3. This was the first knowledge I had of any connection on the part of my office with this unfortunate misunderstanding. I attended only one meeting of the celebration committee prior to the celebration. This meeting was held at Grover, N. C., on Wednesday, September 24 or Thursday, September 25. At that meeting I distinctly recall that the tentative program was under discussion for the purpose of correcting errors. I recall that the name of Senator SMITH appeared on the program, and some one from South Carolina called attention to the fact that there was an error as to his initials. Frankly, I was under the impression, along with the others assembled there, that Senator SMITH was a member of the official Senate committee. I note that you published a telegram purported to have been signed by me and addressed to Mr. C. O. Kuester, chairman of the Kings Mountain Celebration Committee, dated September 26, giving the names of the members of the official Senate committee. I never saw that telegram and knew nothing of its existence until I read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 3. Evidently if that telegram was sent by an official in my office it was sent after the Grover meeting of the committee, and why it was sent I do not know except that my secretary now tells me that it was in response to an inquiry by Mr. Kuester, and that my secretary in that telegram attempted to give the names of the official congressional committee. My secretary assures me, and I can assure you that if an error was committed by him in that telegram, it was purely unintentional. There was no reason in the world why he or I should be interested in doing you an injustice. As to whether Mr. Kuester asked for the membership of the committee or simply for the correct names and addresses of the members I can not say because I have never seen his telegram.

I note you wrote me on October 10 to know by what authority I stated Senator SMITH had been appointed in your stead to represent the Senate on the congressional committee, and for other facts in my possession relating to the matter. This letter was replied to by my assistant secretary informing you of my absence and stating that my attention would be called to your letter upon my return to the office. Unfortunately, in the rush of the campaign my office force failed to call my attention to your letter, and I have never seen it. This was also purely an oversight on the part of Miss Rarey, and both she and I very much regret it. You say you have not had the courtesy of any reply from me except the acknowledgment by my secretary. This statement unfortunately places me in an improper light before the public, since your statement appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I can assure you that personally, neither by word, letter, nor act, have I had any part whatsoever in the misunderstanding and the error in regard to this unfortunate affair, which is deeply regretted by me on your account.

You may use this letter in any way that may seem to you right and proper in justice to all concerned.

With kind personal regards and best wishes always, I am,
Cordially yours,

CHAS. A. JONAS.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Appropriations I report back favorably, with amendments, the bill (H. R. 14246) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 1173) thereon. I desire to serve notice that I shall call up the bill to-morrow for consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

ANNUAL REPORT OF NATIONAL SOCIETY, DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Mr. SHIPSTEAD, from the Committee on Printing, reported a resolution (S. Res. 365), as follows:

Resolved, That the Thirty-third Annual Report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the year ended March 1, 1930, be printed, with illustrations, as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be placed on the calendar.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

Mr. GREENE, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on to-day, December 10, 1930, that committee presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 328) for the relief of Edward C. Dunlap.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS

As in executive session,

Mr. GLASS, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, reported favorably the nomination of Floyd R. Harrison, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Federal Farm Loan Board for a term of eight years expiring August 6, 1938 (reappointment).

Mr. WAGNER, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, reported favorably the nomination of Eugene Meyer, of New York, to be a member of the Federal Reserve Board, for the unexpired term of 10 years from August 10, 1928, vice Edmund Platt.

Mr. NYE, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, reported favorably the nomination of Mrs. Emma L. Warren, of Idaho, to be recorder of the General Land Office, vice Mrs. Mabel P. LeRoy, resigned.

He also, from the same committee, reported the nomination of George W. Miller, of Oregon, to be register of the land office at The Dalles, Oreg., vice James W. Donnelly, deceased.

Mr. BORAH, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported favorably the nomination of J. Reuben Clark, jr., of Utah, to be ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to Mexico; and also the nominations of sundry other persons in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

He also, from the same committee, reported favorably the following conventions:

Executive C, Sixty-ninth Congress, second session, a treaty for the protection of industrial property signed at The Hague on November 6, 1925; and

Executive J, Seventy-first Congress, first session, an inter-American convention for trade-mark and commercial protection, signed at Washington, February 20, 1929.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. COUZENS:

A bill (S. 5225) to amend section 16a of the interstate commerce act; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. REED:

A bill (S. 5226) to authorize appropriation for construction at Randolph Field, San Antonio, Tex., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 5227) to provide books for the adult blind; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HALE:

A bill (S. 5228) granting a pension to Charles S. Follett (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana:

A bill (S. 5229) to provide for relief of unemployed former service men in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A bill (S. 5230) for the relief of Myron M. Andrews; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 5231) authorizing the Secretary of War to award the Congressional Medal of Honor to Joseph A. Minturn; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 5232) granting an increase of pension to Martha D. McCabe (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 5233) granting an increase of pension to Kate Neafus; and

A bill (S. 5234) granting an increase of pension to Phoebe Peak (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 5235) for the relief of Stanton & Jones; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 5236) for the relief of Arlie W. Langford (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 5237) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Gearin (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GREENE:

A bill (S. 5238) granting an increase of pension to Vitaline Beaudet; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

A bill (S. 5239) granting a pension to Mary J. Pearce; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DENEEN:

A bill (S. 5240) granting a pension to Lucinda Hoskins (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 5241) granting a pension to Laura E. Satterfield (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 5242) granting a pension to Samuel Hollenbeck (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MOSES:

A bill (S. 5243) to amend the act reclassifying the salaries of postmasters and employees of the Postal Service, readjusting their salaries and compensation on an equitable basis, increasing postal rates to provide for such readjustment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. FESS:

A bill (S. 5244) granting an increase of pension to Laura F. Carr (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PHIPPS and Mr. WATERMAN:

A bill (S. 5245) for the relief of the Uncompahgre reclamation project, Colorado; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. GEORGE:

A bill (S. 5246) to amend the act entitled "An act for the erection of a tablet or marker to be placed at some suitable point between Hartwell, Ga., and Alford's Bridge, in the County of Hart, State of Georgia, on the national highway between the States of Georgia and South Carolina, to commemorate the memory of Nancy Hart"; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 5247) granting a pension to Cora E. Burlingame Nolan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NORBECK:

A bill (S. 5248) to extend the boundaries of Wind Cave National Park, S. Dak., by adding thereto an area of 320 acres; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 5249) to amend the acts of Congress approved March 3, 1925, and July 3, 1926, known as the District of Columbia traffic acts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AMENDMENT TO TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$7,940 for compensation of officers and employees of the assay office at Boise, Idaho, and for incidental and contingent expenses, etc., intended to be proposed by him to House bill 14246, the Treasury and Post Office Departments appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CHANGES OF REFERENCE

On request of Mr. JONES, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Appropriations was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 12014) to permit payments for the operation of motor cycles and automobiles used for necessary travel on official business on a mileage basis in lieu of actual operating expenses, and it was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

On request of Mr. KING, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was discharged from the further consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 341) to increase the amount authorized for construction of roads within national parks, and it was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

NORTH CAROLINA MEMORIAL ON BATTLEFIELD OF GETTYSBURG

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I ask for publication in the RECORD of the presentation address of Hon. Angus W. McLean, former Governor of North Carolina, upon the occasion of the ceremonies attending the presentation and unveiling of the North Carolina memorial on the battlefield of Gettysburg.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The address is as follows:

ADDRESS OF HON. ANGUS W. McLEAN, FORMER GOVERNOR OF NORTH CAROLINA

Sixty-six years ago upon this field was fought one of the most important battles of all history, a battle in which 160,000 Americans participated. Of these, 100,000 were clad in blue, while 60,000 wore the gray. Here titanic forces struggled for mastery, with such heroism and grim determination that the very word "Gettysburg" has come to symbolize courage and carnage. Indeed, Gettysburg vies with Waterloo as being the most famous battle in the annals of warfare. Here the tide of the Confederacy swept to its crest, paused, and receded. Here confidence was born in the Union Army, which enabled it to endure the terrific punishment of the Wilderness campaigns, Cold Harbor, and Spotsylvania, and which carried it to ultimate victory at Appomattox.

Although the war was to continue its bloody course for nearly two weary years thereafter, here was sprung the arch upon which the Confederate cause rested. Here was fought a battle the effect of which upon the history of the world was destined to be as far-reaching as Marathon or Chalons.

It is useless at this time to search out and to attempt to relate the causes leading up to this martial array of the manhood of America in the greatest death struggle ever staged upon this continent. Over the fateful controversy not only time but the experience of reunion and a common patriotism have spread a veil through which there shines a light of common glory imperishable.

The people of New York, of Pennsylvania, of Virginia, and of North Carolina can now regard the field of Gettysburg as a joint and precious heritage, for it was here that in the fiery furnace of war was fused into a new metal, the amalgam which symbolizes our American character and destiny. Here was written a new amendment to our Constitution—an amendment which although fiercely debated for 50 years could not be agreed upon, but which was here destined to be written into the Constitution in the crimson of the best blood of the land.

What is and will ever be an inspiration to all who ponder these fields, whose fertility is enhanced by the effusion of their blood, is the quality of the men who engaged here in a battle the immediate strategic result of which was not apparent at the

time but which was, nevertheless, in its final results one of the most decisive in history. It is inspiring to reflect that those who in the famous charge carried the assault at the point of the bayonet and those who received the shock equally shed immortal luster and renown upon the name of America. The infantry of Lee, that could march through the valley of death almost with the precision of a dress parade, were men who a short while before had come from the farms and villages of the rural South. Their ways and their lives had been those of peace. They were without martial training or ambition. Yet the horsemen of Stuart, the famous foot cavalry of Jackson, Lee's "incomparable infantry," had performed miracles in battle, greater than those which Napoleon called forth from the professional soldiers composing his "Old Guard," and the men who behind the stone walls of Cemetery Ridge could watch without wavering the oncoming hosts of Pickett's and Pettigrew's immortal divisions, who could endure for hours what was till then the greatest artillery duel ever staged and bear it unflinchingly, also possessed those qualities of intrepid courage which have characterized the American soldier from the days of the Revolution to the days of the World War.

Whence came the power inherent in these unschooled troops to perform brilliant marches, to carry out deadly charges, to interpose the stubborn and courageous defenses that illumine the records of both sides in this epochal struggle? Surely from nothing less than the morale which springs from a deep conviction of the righteousness and justice of their cause, which is concerned not so much with the quarrel as with the principle, and which follows a belief and sanctifies a faith to the final sacrifice. To such men handicaps became an incentive, courage became their creed, and death their accolade. It was at once the pity and the glory of those days of exaltation that there flamed impartially in the breast of the southern and northern soldier—Americans all—a sense of duty that could not be reconciled except on such a field as this of Gettysburg. Such, my countrymen, were the men who struggled and died here.

It is the advantage of an occasion like this, when we are met to commemorate a great record of valor, that we can renew and refresh our faith in our common ancestry, whose devotion to their cause brought them into this fierce combat. This idea was well expressed by that great and impartial journal, the London Spectator, a few years ago, when it said:

"It is now over half a century since the last shot was fired in the most desperate war in the history of the Anglo-Saxon race. Nowadays we see that great struggle in clearer perspective, and we can judge the causes for which the combatants fought with some reasonable perception of their value to mankind. But the chief interest of the war lies in the fact that it was a genuine conflict of idealisms, fervently held and loyally followed by both sides. No struggle has been grimmer, and yet none has been less strained by the darkest passions of war."

So, 66 years ago, this great battle came to pass, much in the manner of a thunderstorm, beginning with intermittent flashes of lightning and the rumble of distant thunder.

From Bethel to Gettysburg the fight raged on—even from Sumter to fateful Appomattox, which marked the end.

Viewing the four years' struggle from any standpoint, Gettysburg attracts and holds our attention. It was here that the high hand of destiny intervened and overruled the aspirations of the South.

Following Chancellorsville, where that great military genius, Stonewall Jackson, was stricken down, Lee decided to abandon defensive warfare and to take the offensive, hoping that a victory on enemy soil would gain foreign recognition for the Confederacy, with consequent material support for the southern cause. He therefore crossed the Potomac and invaded Pennsylvania, watched by Meade, who carefully kept his army between that of Lee and the city of Washington. Gettysburg, destined to become the Nation's shrine, was not then in the picture. Heth's division of Lee's army approached Gettysburg, where he unexpectedly came in contact with brigades of Buford's Federal cavalry. Skirmishing followed; both sides hurriedly called for reinforcements, and thus what finally became the great battle unexpectedly developed. The fight, having thus started on July 1, steadily augmented until the final crescendo of July 3.

Ewell's corps arrived during the first day. Of his divisions, Rhodes's arrived first, including Iverson's North Carolina brigade and the brigades of Daniels, Ramseur, and Hoke. In Hill's division was Pettigrew's brigade, and under Pender were Lane and Scales. In Davis's brigade was the Fifty-fifth North Carolina under Connally. Of the 16 brigades engaged the first day on the Confederate side, 7 were from North Carolina.

Pettigrew's brigade, composed of the Eleventh, Twenty-sixth, Forty-seventh, and Fifty-second Regiments, was, with other Confederate troops, thrown against the famous "Iron Brigade" of the Federal Army, whose boast it was that it had never known defeat.

Here was the grim setting for a duel—two veteran brigades, one in blue, the other in gray, with both of whom victory had become an established habit.

Through the wheat field, tumbling and pitching on death, ranks closing to fill the horrible gaps cut by the Federal Artillery, these fearless southerners moved steadily forward against the heights fronting them, which soon were sheeted with flame. The rebel yell shrills out, there is a surge forward, and the "Iron Brigade," for the first time in its history, breaks and falls back to Seminary Ridge. Once more the charge is sounded. Once more the regiments in gray press forward, and Seminary Ridge has been captured for General Lee.

It is the ground upon which two days later the Confederates are to take their stand and against overwhelming odds make their bid for final victory. Of the 3,000 who marched through the wheat field on this parade with death, less than 2,000 remained to consolidate their position. The Twenty-sixth North Carolina alone lost in this engagement 28 officers and 468 men, including its gallant Col. Harry K. Burgwyn.

Iverson's brigade on that first day also fought a magnificent fight. Single handed it was thrown against a Federal division posted in a railroad cut. Here, without faltering, it charged almost up to the very wall itself, and the dead lay so thick that one could walk from one end of the line to the other upon the bodies of the slain. The brigades of Iverson and Scales were almost destroyed, Iverson reporting the loss of over 500 men in his brigade alone.

All seven North Carolina brigades engaged that day fought desperately and sustained severe losses.

On the second day Lee proposed to assault both flanks of the Federals and gain possession of the commanding eminences known as Culp's Hill and Roundtop. Among other assaults Hoke's North Carolina brigade (temporarily commanded by the valiant Avery) and Hayes's Louisiana brigade are directed to take Cemetery Hill, the commanding eminence on the right flank of the Federal position. On this sector they repeat the triumph of the first day, reach the hill which is considered the key to the Federal position, and occupy it. Unfortunately Avery is killed at the moment of temporary triumph. Ewell, however, fails to realize the importance of the position thus won with so much of sacrifice, and that night Hoke's brigade unwillingly obeys the order to retire. Elsewhere the southerners had suffered reverses on that day. It was here that the gallant Pender, the Christian soldier, who, in the estimation of competent military men, ranked among the highest, received the wound from which he died.

During the night which followed the second day's battle, reinforcements reached both armies, and Lee, encouraged by the success of the previous fighting and by the arrival of Pickett's division and Stuart's cavalry, decided to renew the battle and force a final decision. Meade's council of war reached the same conclusion, and so the morning of the third day found the preliminary plans fully developed and both armies confronting each other in battle array. Volumes have been written of this day's engagement, but all that can be said beyond any controversy is that there was here staged a deathless pageant of battle till then unequaled in the history of warfare.

Lee ordered Longstreet to make a direct frontal attack upon the Federal forces massed on Cemetery Hill, the assault to be preceded and covered by the fire of all the artillery which the Confederate Army possessed. At 1 o'clock in the afternoon a signal gun gave warning and immediately Seminary Ridge shook with the roar of 150 Confederate guns pouring a terrific fire upon the Federal forces occupying the opposite heights. Finally Alexander, chief of Confederate artillery, sent word to Longstreet that if the assault was to be made at all, it must be made then, as the artillery ammunition was almost exhausted. When this message was delivered, Pickett saluted Longstreet and said: "Sir, I shall lead my division forward," and Longstreet bowed assent.

Forward was the command, and as the bugles to right and left signaled announcement, the magnificent divisions of Pickett and Pettigrew, with the supporting troops, moved forward into the valley of death. What chance and overwhelming odds had confused, valor endeavored now to redeem. As the guns ceased their roar the shock troops of the South put the issue to the test, and 15,000 men marched forward in the hope of achieving the miracle of victory.

In the front line marched 13 Virginia and 5 North Carolina regiments; in the second line marched 5 Virginia and 10 North Carolina regiments. The North Carolina brigades of Pettigrew, Scales, and Lane were in these advancing lines, as were also other troops from other Southern States.

As the Confederates debouch on this last high offensive venture the Union guns, silent till then, suddenly come to life. Their fire has been withheld to meet this very assault. All the Federal artillery is turned on the Confederates, who, in the pattern of ancient chivalry, advance in the open. Their muskets are at right shoulder shift. Killed and wounded mark their path, but still the ranks close and still on they come. Behind stone walls, along the fences of a transverse road the Union infantry lurks and attacks the brave southerners. Still on they come! Fire pours in upon them from the front and from the flanks. On, and the cannon now fire at point-blank range upon them. Great gaps are cut into the living ranks! They close up and move steadily forward! Finally, at the double quick, the heights are reached, and here and there a huddled handful reach and surmount the stone walls. Armistead, of New Bern, waving his cap upon the point of his sword, falls dead within the wall. Guns are spiked; soldiers fight fiercely hand to hand; clubbed muskets are used; standards are planted. The heights have been carried and the Confederacy is at the crest of its high tide. But Federal reinforcements come thronging up, the Confederates are caught on all sides by enfilading fire in a very trap of death. No reinforcements reach them; there had been delays that have never been satisfactorily explained. The high tide ebbs; the effort failed; and the broken fragments of the southern columns drift sullenly back down the slopes whence they came. Here they were met by Lee, who, with tears in his eyes, magnanimously took upon himself responsibility for the failure.

But Lee did not really fail. He was never more triumphant than at this moment, fraught as it undoubtedly was with even

greater peril to his stricken army. The military critic of the London Spectator, after describing Gettysburg, says of him: "He was probably the greatest soldier since Napoleon, the embodiment of every gift of mind and character. * * * Every day his power grew and his last campaign is a flawless example of how a great force may be baffled with slender resources. And with it all he remained the ideal of a Christian soldier, humble, courteous, gentle, so that with Sir John Moore he may stand as the true type of the happy warrior."

In this connection let me say that we have been highly honored in the selection of a site for this memorial in such close proximity to the magnificent equestrian statue of General Lee, the gift of our sister State of Virginia. The devotion to this matchless leader displayed by North Carolinians, who followed him to the end, was surpassed by none—not even by the valorous sons of his native State.

While we are met here especially to honor the North Carolina heroes of this momentous conflict, I can not let the occasion pass without expressing admiration for and paying tribute to the valor here displayed by the soldiers of Virginia, with whom North Carolinians have stood, shoulder to shoulder, in every struggle from the fight for American independence to this hour.

Our past failure to erect a suitable memorial on this battlefield has not been due to any lack of appreciation of the part North Carolina troops took in this battle, but it was entirely due to a proud poverty now proudly overcome. Throughout the years that devoted band of women, the United Daughters of the Confederacy, never ceased to call the attention of those in authority to the State's responsibility to those who died upon this field.

It was largely due to the urgent insistence of the committee of the Daughters of the Confederacy, of which Mrs. Marshall Williams was chairman, that in 1927, while governor of the State, I included in my message an appeal to the general assembly to provide the necessary funds for this memorial.

Hon. Walter Murphy and Judge N. A. Townsend rendered distinguished service in the presentation of the matter in the committees; and on the floor of the assembly their superb management resulted in an unanimous vote.

It afforded me distinct pleasure, as the son of a Confederate soldier, to throw the weight of my official influence into this movement. Pursuant to the act authorizing the appropriation, I appointed the following on the part of the State as members of the North Carolina Gettysburg Memorial Commission: Mrs. Marshall Williams, Mrs. J. Dolph Long, Mrs. Felix Harvey, sr., Mrs. L. B. Nowell, Mrs. Glen Long, Capt. Dougald Stewart, Capt. Samuel S. Nash, H. C. McQueen, Col. Virgil S. Lusk, Gen. Albert L. Cox, William A. Erwin, Pollock Burgwyn, A. L. Brooks, Maj. W. C. Heath, and Col. A. H. Boyden, who recently passed to his reward after devoting much of his life, first, to service in the Confederate Army itself, and second, in caring for the widows and orphans of his former comrades in arms. He was to have taken official part in these exercises, and his presence is sorely missed by those of us who came under his benign influence.

An advisory commission was appointed to serve with the memorial commission in choosing a design composed of W. W. Fuller, of New York; Maj. Bruce Cotten, of Baltimore; Maj. Daniel M. Barringer, of Philadelphia; and George Gordon Battle, of New York, all native sons of North Carolina. To the work of the commission and advisory commission I would pay deserved tribute. They performed well the difficult task laid upon them, and are assured of the sincere gratitude of those who cherish the memory of the gallant soldiers whose heroic deeds are represented in the fine effigy we now behold.

Having aided so materially in securing an appropriation for the State memorial, the North Carolina division, United Daughters of the Confederacy, determined to erect, by their own efforts and with their own funds, handsome markers which complete the beauty of the State memorial, and which will also be presented to-day.

A great poet has said that "battles are fought by the mothers of men"; and that "back of every brave soldier is a brave woman." Peculiarly was this true of the old South. Our soldiers who fought here had back of them a great gallery of Spartan womanhood. They fought with the consciousness that their conduct was applauded by their loved ones at home. Those who survived came back to a comradeship and fealty that preserved for them the benevolent illusion that in spite of everything they had been victorious.

It is true that all this is of the past, but it is not buried. It is neither dead nor forgotten. It lives and grows and contributes to the spirit, the hope, and the aspirations of this great Nation we call America. We can not forget, our Daughters of the Confederacy will not let us forget, the record of imperishable valor and devotion to duty stamped by our fathers upon this historic field.

The memorial now presented is the work of the noted sculptor, Gutzon Borglum, who is with us to-day. He has in a masterly way interpreted in bronze the spirit and purpose of the North Carolinians who took part in this great battle. The heroic group represents five typical North Carolina soldiers. Four of the group have just emerged from a small wooded area. As they come out of it into the open, they suddenly see the awful struggle in front of them. The Federals are just across a small ravine, both sides of which are covered with fighting men, many of them wounded and dying. The field has been torn with shot and shell.

The leader of the group pushes forward, determined on his grim task; the younger man just behind him is stunned momentarily at the awful sight; the bearded soldier to his left, realizing what is taking place in the youth's mind, draws close to him and whispers confidence. The color bearer in the rear presses forward,

holding the flag aloft and well to the front of the group. At the right, one knee on the ground, is an officer encouraging his men, his presence and wounds indicating that the struggle has been in progress some time. Each of them knows that he is rushing into the very jaws of death, never to return, and yet he does not falter. The whole group discloses spirited action and typifies North Carolina troops as they charge up the heights of Cemetery Hill.

In presenting this memorial on behalf of the North Carolina Gettysburg Memorial Commission, I am moved with admiration as I behold a beautiful work of art, but a deeper sense of pride wells up in my heart as I contemplate the spirit it typifies—not a spirit of partisanship, nor of envy of another section, but a spirit of supreme devotion to our common country, its traditions and its aspirations. We no longer think in terms of physical combat, but in terms of peaceful progress. Toward our National Government, into whose keeping this memorial is this day given, no State feels or manifests a more loyal spirit than North Carolina. We may disagree with other States or sections upon some public questions, we may exercise a wholesome independence in the pursuit of our tasks, but to defend the flag of our beloved country we would give our all. This attitude has been fully demonstrated since the battle fought here.

When the war with Spain came we were not only ready and anxious to defend our country, but the blood of a North Carolina naval officer was the first to be shed in that struggle.

Sacrifices in that war were not so great as those we had theretofore undergone, or those we were destined to undergo in later years, when in defense of democracy the United States entered the World War. North Carolina then blazed with patriotic fervor from one end to the other, and our people contributed most liberally in men and money.

It became the high privilege of troops from our State, shoulder to shoulder with their comrades from New York, to break the most stubborn line ever flung across a battlefield. The same American spirit that moved those who made the gallant charge at Gettysburg under the Stars and Bars was regnant in those who broke the Hindenburg line under the Stars and Stripes. And that same spirit exists to-day and will continue to exist until the floodgates of life close in eternal rest.

And so, my friends, in a golden mist of American valor lies Gettysburg. Sectional lines no longer mar its peaceful slopes. No longer do we recognize in its clouds of imperishable glory the devices of its flags. Yonder dying sun reflects from this field one flag, and one alone—the glorious emblem of our common country.

With a feeling of pride inspired by the valor of our fathers who here offered upon the altar of their country "the last full measure of devotion," with tender sentiments for the cause they represented, and with unreserved love for the reunited Nation in which we live and strive to-day, I give this memorial into the keeping of the United States of America.

When in the years to come it shall catch the morning's first gleam and reflect the last rays of the setting sun, my prayer is that it shall inspire all who behold it to emulate the glorious valor and patriotic devotion to duty which characterized those brave North Carolinians, who under the leadership of the immortal Lee fought and died upon this field.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR EMERGENCY CONSTRUCTION

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, from the Committee on Appropriations I report back favorably with amendments the bill (H. R. 14804) making supplemental appropriations to provide for emergency construction on certain public works during the remainder of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, with a view to increasing employment. By direction of the committee, I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I do not desire to object, but the Senator will recall that on yesterday I served notice that I desired to take the floor for a short time this morning. However, with the understanding that the consideration of the bill will take only a short time, I shall not object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The amendments of the Committee on Appropriations were, on page 2, line 20, after the word "out," to insert the words "or obligated," and in line 21, after the word "performed," to insert the words "or to be performed," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the purpose of providing for emergency construction on certain public works during the remainder of the fiscal year 1931 with a view to increasing employment, namely:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FOREST SERVICE

Improvement of national forests: For the construction and maintenance of roads, trails, bridges, fire lanes, etc., including the same objects specified under this head in the agricultural appropriation act for the fiscal year 1931, \$3,000,000.

Federal-aid highway system: For apportionment to the several States under the provisions of the Federal highway act, as amended, as a temporary advance of funds to meet the provisions of such act as to State funds required on Federal-aid projects, \$80,000,000: *Provided*, That the sums so advanced shall be reimbursed to the Federal Government over a period of five years, commencing with the fiscal year 1933, by making deductions from regular apportionments made from future authorizations for carrying out the provisions of such act as amended and supplemented: *Provided further*, That the amounts advanced in consequence hereof shall be limited in each case to the sum actually paid out or obligated by a State under such advance for work performed or to be performed before September 1, 1931, for the construction of Federal-aid projects: *Provided further*, That should any State fail to claim any part of its allotment hereunder the President may reapportion such unclaimed funds to States capable of using them prior to September 1, 1931.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Roads and trails: For the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of roads and trails, inclusive of necessary bridges, in the national parks and national monuments under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, fiscal year 1931, \$1,500,000.

WAR DEPARTMENT
CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Rivers and harbors: For the preservation and maintenance of existing river and harbor works, and for the prosecution of such projects heretofore authorized as may be most desirable in the interests of commerce and navigation, etc., including the same objects specified under this head in the War Department appropriation act for the fiscal year 1931, \$22,500,000, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers and to remain available until expended.

Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries: For prosecuting the work of flood control in accordance with the provisions of the flood control act, approved May 15, 1928 (U. S. C., Supp. III, title 33, sec. 702a), \$3,000,000, to remain available until expended.

SEC. 2. The sums herein appropriated shall be available interchangeably for expenditure on the objects named in this act upon order of the President stating the amounts and the appropriations between which such interchanges are to be made.

SEC. 3. A report shall be submitted to Congress on the first day of the next regular session showing, by projects or other appropriate detailed classification, the amounts allocated under each of the foregoing appropriations, the expenditures under each allocation, and such other information which the President may deem pertinent in advising Congress as to the allocation and expenditure of such appropriations.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I observe that the bill carries an appropriation of \$110,000,000.

Mr. JONES. It does.

Mr. COPELAND. The request of the President was for \$150,000,000. Am I right in assuming that the reason why the committee adopted a smaller sum or took the amount approved by the House is because the other \$40,000,000 will be cared for in the first deficiency appropriation bill?

Mr. JONES. The Senator is right. There were several items included which the House committee felt required considerable hearings. There was no controversy as to the items now in the bill. Under the need of early action we took the House proposal.

Mr. COPELAND. The Senator has every hope that the items covered by the additional \$40,000,000 will be carried in the first deficiency appropriation bill and in all human probability that bill will be before us very soon?

Mr. JONES. Either before the holidays or very shortly thereafter.

Mr. COPELAND. The Senator understands I ask this question in order that the RECORD may show it, because personally I am in favor of going as far as the President is willing to go and somewhat farther than that. At any rate, this bill carries \$110,000,000 and in the deficiency appropriation bill we shall get the \$40,000,000 additional and perhaps more?

Mr. JONES. That will be taken care of.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I have just entered the Chamber and did not hear the Senator's explanation. The Senator has probably made some explanation of the bill which is now before us?

Mr. JONES. Yes. The bill now before us provides \$110,000,000 instead of \$150,000,000 which the President recom-

mended as an emergency appropriation. This bill passed the House yesterday and is now before us for consideration.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Washington whether there are any provisions in the bill to make any change in the manner in which contracts are to be let or bids to be submitted?

Mr. JONES. No.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I have just come to the Chamber from a committee meeting and I have not had a chance to read the bill.

Mr. JONES. There is no change in the provisions of the bill in that respect.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I noticed the Senator introduced a bill a day or two ago, and had it referred, which contains a provision to permit bids to be made without reference to certain sections of the statutes which regulate the letting of contracts.

Mr. JONES. There is no such provision in this measure.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. In other words, if this bill is passed, contracts will have to be let under the general provisions of the law as it now exists?

Mr. JONES. That is the way I understand it.

Mr. HARRISON. This is the bill which passed the House on yesterday?

Mr. JONES. It is.

Mr. HARRISON. It has already been considered by the Appropriations Committee of the Senate?

Mr. JONES. It has.

Mr. HARRISON. I notice the President recommended \$160,000,000.

Mr. JONES. No; \$150,000,000.

Mr. HARRISON. The amount has been reduced to \$110,000,000?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON. Has the Senator told the Senate yet wherein those reductions were made?

Mr. JONES. The Senator has not. The items are covered in the report of the House committee. There are a great many items which the House committee felt ought to have some investigation and study before they were incorporated in a measure. So only the items about which there was no question were put in this bill. The House committee assured the House that the other items would be taken up in the first deficiency appropriation bill which will be reported just before the holidays or soon thereafter. The Committee on Appropriations of the Senate also takes that attitude. I can assure the Senate that the other \$40,000,000 will be cared for at a very early date, but we thought in the interest of time and the prompt passage of this measure we had better take it with the important items now included in it.

Mr. HARRISON. The fact, then, that the House reduced the appropriation by \$40,000,000 and that the Senate Committee on Appropriations approved that reduction will not be considered as indicative of the opposition of either the House or the Senate Committee on Appropriations to the other \$40,000,000?

Mr. JONES. Not at all.

Mr. HARRISON. I may say to the Senator that I was just curious to know why the decrease was made in this emergency after the President made his suggestion.

Mr. JONES. There were a great many items embodied in the \$150,000,000 which we thought ought to have some further study and about which we thought there should be further information obtained. They were not very definite, while the particular items contained in the bill were definite, concrete, and important.

Mr. HARRISON. How much did the President suggest with reference to the Mississippi River project?

Mr. JONES. I do not remember what the President suggested with reference to that item. I can not tell the Senator.

Mr. HARRISON. Was that item reduced?

Mr. JONES. I do not know. The House put in \$3,000,000 for that project. I do not think the President really gave a detailed estimate of the various items of the \$150,000,000.

Mr. HARRISON. There were some estimates made by some agency of the Federal Government as to the allocation of the various amounts, I presume, in arriving at the lump-sum appropriation of \$150,000,000.

Mr. JONES. Yes. The committee did not go into the details of the estimates. We accepted the House proposal. I thought there was a table showing a tentative allotment of the \$150,000,000, but I do not find it here. It probably is in the hearings.

Mr. HARRISON. Can the Senator tell us whether or not the committee has included in this appropriation bill all that was suggested by the executive department for highway construction?

Mr. JONES. We had the various departments communicated with by telephone and they said they were very well satisfied with the action of the House and that they would present their additional claims in connection with the deficiency appropriation bill.

Mr. HARRISON. Then the Senate has no assurance that the full amount is going to be appropriated as first suggested by the executive department?

Mr. JONES. The chairman of the House committee assured the House that it would be done, and the Senate committee is determined, if the House does not cover the \$40,000,000, to see to it that it is covered by a Senate amendment.

Mr. HARRISON. I do not understand then what the Senator said about the heads of the departments stating that they were very well satisfied with what the House had done.

Mr. JONES. That was for immediate action. It does not mean that they are satisfied to get no more money in the future, but simply that they are satisfied temporarily with \$110,000,000.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator is of the opinion, as chairman of the committee, that another bill will come before us supplying the difference between the suggestion of the President and the action of the House?

Mr. JONES. I am.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. JONES. I do.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. May I ask the Senator from Washington whether the Appropriations Committee has heard the chairman of the President's unemployment commission, Colonel Woods, with regard to any of these appropriations for public works and what that commission has found to be necessary in order to relieve the unemployment situation?

Mr. JONES. No; the committee has had no hearings so far.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. May I suggest to the Senator very respectfully that, as I understand it from a reading of the public prints, that commission has attempted to make a comprehensive survey of the situation over the country, and it seems to me the Appropriations Committee and the Congress and the country ought to have the benefit of whatever information is in the possession of that commission, together with the judgment of its chairman, if he has any, based upon the survey which he has made.

Mr. JONES. We shall doubtless have it at a later time.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to enable me to make a statement to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. JONES. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I want to say that this bill, in my judgment, makes a notable gift, if we may so term it, or loan, if we may determine it to be a loan, to good roads and to river and harbor improvement. I think it is entirely right that it should be done. But so far as present unemployment is concerned, if those who are now unemployed wait for any benefits likely to accrue to any considerable number of them under this measure they will wait a long time.

I will say to the Senator that while this bill will mean quite a number of additional employed people in the course of, say, the next four or five or six months or possibly a year, yet so far as any immediate help to the unemployed is concerned it seems to me that by the time we get a deficiency appropriation and then start the cumbersome machinery of public buildings and public roads and of the War Department work on rivers and harbors it will be quite a long while before the unemployment situation will receive any benefit from it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I wish to say, in response to the suggestion of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], I hope he did not get the impression from the question which I directed to the chairman of the committee that I regarded the pending bill as anything but a very small measure of relief for the present unemployment situation. I merely took this occasion to make a very respectful suggestion to the chairman of the committee that Congress should have the benefit of any available studies which have been made concerning the unemployment problem. Having noticed that the commission appointed by the President, headed by Colonel Woods, had endeavored to make some survey of the situation, I expressed the hope that the committee would, in the course of the consideration of these measures, at some appropriate time obtain for the use of the committee and Congress such information and such recommendations as Colonel Woods's commission may have available.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think the Senator from Wisconsin is entirely right; his suggestion is well taken, and I use this occasion for the purpose of informing the Senate, if I may, that the number of unemployed will not be very greatly decreased under the terms of this bill, at least, for quite a while.

Mr. JONES. Of course there is a difference of opinion with reference to that matter, but I am not going to take the time of the Senate to discuss it.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. JONES. I yield.

Mr. BINGHAM. I was hoping that the chairman of the committee would state to the Senate, for its enlightenment, the information which is in the record from the Chief of Engineers and from the Chief of the Bureau of Public Roads to the effect that it will be possible to use this money in the very near future. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] implied that it might be a year before some of this money could be used. The bill, however, specifically states in regard to the road projects that the money must be used for projects to be paid for before the 1st of next September.

Furthermore the Chief of the Bureau of Public Roads has testified that a large amount of this money can be used immediately, and particularly in the Southern States the work will go forward at once.

The Chief of Engineers of the United States Army also has testified that the \$22,000,000 intended for river and harbor projects can be used within the next few months. It is, therefore, unfair and unduly discouraging to those who are trying to seek employment to tell them that the money which we are now proposing to appropriate can not be used for six months or so.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator in charge of the bill a question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Why is the provision inserted on page 1, "for emergency construction on certain public works during the remainder of the fiscal year 1931"?

Mr. JONES. It is really expected to have this money expended by the beginning of the next fiscal year; that is the purpose; and I suppose that is the reason the House inserted that language. I gather from discussion and debate over there that it is expected the money will be expended within the next six months.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. But assuming that the money shall not be fully expended, is it the intention of the proponents of the bill to let the work lapse and allow unemployment to recur? What is the idea?

Mr. JONES. No; the work will certainly be continued.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. But it can not be continued under this provision of the bill.

Mr. JONES. We shall provide, of course, by appropriate legislation for the continuance of the work. I have an idea that that provision was inserted in the bill to encourage the hastening of the expenditure of the money.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. But at the expiration of the present fiscal year we may not be in session. When does the Senator understand that the period of availability of the appropriation will expire?

Mr. JONES. On June 30, 1931. Of course, if we see that the work is not progressing we can take further action.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Just a moment. On June 30, 1931, unless the President shall convene the Congress in extraordinary session we will be powerless to legislate. I think I understand the object of this provision. It is intended to treat this emergency period as limited to six months; it is to assume that at the expiration of six months the need for the relief that the bill contemplates will have terminated. What I can not understand is why the proponents of the bill put themselves in the attitude of forcing an extraordinary session of Congress in order to carry on the work which they find so necessary, and which we all believe to be necessary, by inserting in the bill a provision that all the money must be spent by June 30, 1931, or it may not be spent at all. If the emergency has not terminated by that time, why not go on with the work that has been begun during the period? Why not relate it to the emergency rather than attempt by law to limit the emergency to six months? The Senator understands what I am suggesting?

Mr. JONES. I do; but I will say to the Senator that the committee really gave that matter no consideration. I remember in the hearings before the House committee that it was expected this money should be expended within the next six months; and I gathered the impression that this language was put in really to hurry and expedite the expenditure of the money proposed to be appropriated.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Of course it is not desired to force the expenditure of the money in a reckless or extravagant way—

Mr. JONES. No.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. But we all know how long it takes to put big machinery in operation.

Mr. JONES. If the Senator will offer an amendment at that point in the bill, I will be glad to consider it.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I suggest to the Senator that the appropriation ought not to be limited as to its availability to the remainder of the fiscal year. Let it read, "for emergency construction on certain public works," and strike out the words "during the remainder of the fiscal year 1931."

Mr. JONES. I will say to the Senator I am perfectly willing to have that done.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Very well; I propose that amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arkansas offers an amendment, which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 6, after the word "works," it is proposed to strike out the words "during the remainder of the fiscal year 1931."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. JONES. I do.

Mr. WAGNER. I should like to ask the Senator what definite information he has as to the projects upon which this money will be expended before a period of, say, five or

six months from now. It is very easy to say that we will attempt to spend this money at once in order to relieve unemployment, but I think we ought to know, if the information is available, on what particular projects operations will begin so as to employ labor prior to six months from now.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, of course, I can not tell the Senator just what particular projects will be begun under the \$3,000,000 for the improvement of the national forests. The department, however, has a program in connection with the national forest to which it can apply that money.

Then, work on the highway systems will be carried on under the general highway act, and that money, of course, will be used in the various States of the Union.

With reference to the river and harbor item, I know that the projects are set forth in the hearings by the testimony of the Chief of Engineers, and the projects are enumerated.

Mr. SMOOT. I have the projects listed before me, and, if the Senator so desires, will mention them.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. JONES. I yield.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, are they projects upon which all the plans, surveys, and specifications are now ready?

Mr. SMOOT. They are now ready.

Mr. WAGNER. So that work may begin the moment the appropriation is made and labor may be thus employed upon those projects. That is the information which I should like to have verified.

Mr. SMOOT and Mr. WALSH of Montana addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. JONES. I have yielded to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the testimony before the House committee shows the following allotments to various river and harbor projects. First comes the North Atlantic division, as follows:

Statement showing allotments from proposed emergency appropriation of \$22,500,000 and probable expenditure to May 1, 1931
[Asterisk denotes project authorized by river and harbor act approved July 3, 1930]

North Atlantic division:	Allotment
*Lynn Harbor, Mass.....	\$90,000
*New Bedford Harbor, Mass.....	239,000
*Fall River Harbor, Mass.....	200,000
*New Haven Harbor, Conn.....	53,000
*Bridgeport Harbor, Conn.....	153,000
*Hay (West) Harbor, N. Y.....	12,500
*Hudson River, N. Y.....	169,000
*Raritan River, N. J.....	344,000
*Washington Canal and South River, N. J.....	90,000
*Manasquan River, N. J.....	300,000
*San Juan Harbor, P. R.....	5,000
*Delaware River, between Philadelphia and Trenton.....	90,000
*Delaware River, Philadelphia to the sea.....	682,000
*Delaware River at Camden, N. J.....	150,000
*Schuylkill River, Pa.....	400,000
*Big Timber Creek, N. J.....	14,000
*Wilmington Harbor, Del.....	100,000
*Little Machipongo River, Va.....	10,000
	3,141,500

The projects in the South Atlantic division are as follows:

South Atlantic division:	Allotment
*Baltimore Harbor and Channel, Md.....	\$797,000
*Elk and Little Elk Rivers, Md.....	6,000
*Claiborne Harbor, Md.....	12,100
*Choptank River, Md.....	6,300
*Wicomico River, Md.....	75,000
*Herring Bay and Rockhole Creek, Md.....	6,300
*Monroe Bay and Creek, Md.....	15,200
*Carters Creek, Va.....	8,000
*Cockrells Creek, Va.....	59,000
*Horn Harbor, Va.....	6,000
*Smith Creek, Md.....	7,500
*Norfolk Harbor, Va.....	126,700
*Willoughby Channel, Va.....	8,500
*James River, Va.....	478,000
*Nansemond River, Va.....	92,300
*Ocohanock Creek, Va.....	17,000
*Nandua Creek, Va.....	2,000
*Knobbs Creek, N. C.....	79,000
*Edenton Harbor, N. C.....	57,000
*Cashie River, N. C.....	5,000

South Atlantic division—Continued.

	Allotment
*Roanoke River, N. C.	\$46,500
*Mackay Creek, N. C.	1,100
*Far Creek, N. C.	30,000
*Silver Lake Harbor, N. C.	11,000
*Beaufort Harbor, N. C.	55,000
*Morehead City Harbor, N. C.	35,000
*Cape Fear River, N. C., at and below Wilmington.	785,000
*Waterway from Cape Fear River to Winyah Bay, S. C.	530,000
*Waccamaw River, S. C.	12,500
*Shipyard Creek (River), S. C.	24,000
*Savannah Harbor, Ga.	90,000
*Brunswick Harbor, Ga.	608,000
*Waterway from Beaufort, S. C., to St. Johns River, Fla.	10,000
	4,200,000

The projects in the Gulf of Mexico division represent a total of \$2,821,400; in the upper Mississippi Valley division, \$8,632,060; in the Great Lakes division, \$1,157,000; in the South Pacific division, \$993,000; in the North Pacific division, \$1,555,000. I ask that the tables showing the individual items under each of those divisions may be incorporated in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The tables referred to are as follows:

Gulf of Mexico division:

*St. Johns River, Fla., Jacksonville to the ocean	\$111,000
*Harbor at Miami, Fla.	200,000
*Charlotte Harbor, Fla.	22,500
*Tampa Harbor, Fla.	395,940
*St. Petersburg Harbor, Fla.	45,000
*Caloosahatchee River—Lake Okeechobee	50,000
*St. Marks River, Fla.	11,000
*East Pass Channel from the Gulf of Mexico into Choctawhatchee Bay, Fla.	10,000
*Intracoastal waterway from Pensacola Bay to Mobile Bay, Ala.	160,000
*Mobile Bay—Mississippi Sound Channel	55,000
*Biloxi Harbor, Miss.	52,000
*Intracoastal waterway from Mobile, Ala., to New Orleans, La.	20,000
*Mobile Harbor, Ala.	120,000
*Houston Ship Channel, Tex.	954,000
*Texas City Channel, Tex.	100,000
*Aransas Pass—Corpus Christi Channel, Tex.	515,000
	2,821,440

Upper Mississippi Valley division:

*Illinois River, Ill.	1,200,000
*Mississippi River, between Ohio River and Minneapolis, Minn.	2,400,600
*Allegheny River, Pa., locks and dams—Ohio River—	500,000
Lock and dam construction	800,000
Open channel improvement	400,000
*Kanawha River, W. Va.	1,000,000
*Tennessee River—Missouri River—	50,000
Kansas City to the mouth	1,632,060
Kansas City to Sioux City	600,000
*Mill Creek and South Slough, Ill.	50,000
	8,632,060

Great Lakes division:

Duluth-Superior Harbor, Minn. and Wis.	90,000
Fox River, Wis.	8,000
Milwaukee Harbor, Wis.	200,000
Calumet Harbor and River, Ill. and Ind.	322,000
Chicago River, Ill.	68,000
Chicago Harbor, Ill.	8,000
*Detroit River, Mich.	187,000
*Lorain Harbor, Ohio	66,000
Buffalo Harbor, N. Y.	80,000
Examinations, surveys, and contingencies—	
Duluth district	14,000
Milwaukee district	15,000
Detroit district	55,000
Buffalo district	44,000
	1,157,000

South Pacific division:

*Redwood Creek, Calif.	26,000
*Suisun Bay Channel, Calif.	52,000
Petaluma Creek, Calif.	50,000
San Rafael Creek, Calif.	10,000
*Humboldt Harbor and Bar, Calif.	92,000

South Pacific division—Continued.

*San Diego Harbor, Calif.	\$323,000
*Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbors, Calif.	410,000
*Middle River and Empire Cut, Calif.	3,000
Sacramento River, Calif.	24,000
Mokelumne River, Calif.	3,000
	993,000

North Pacific division:

*Coquille River, Oreg.	100,000
*Coos Bay, Oreg.	125,000
*Columbia and Lower Willamette Rivers	250,000
*Willamette River between Oregon City and Portland, Oreg.	167,000
*Lake River, Wash.	3,000
*Olympia Harbor, Wash.	56,000
*Tacoma Harbor, Wash.	136,000
*Bellingham Harbor, Wash.	25,000
*Seattle Harbor, Wash.	105,000
*Quillayute River, Wash.	112,000
*Everett Harbor, Wash.	142,000
*Ketchikan Creek, Alaska	272,000
*Port Alexander, Alaska	17,000
*Harbor of Refuge at Seward, Alaska	45,000

1,555,000

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, to recapitulate so that the Senate may know the allotments to the various divisions, I will say that for the North Atlantic division the total is \$3,141,500; for the South Atlantic division, \$4,200,000; for the Gulf of Mexico division, \$2,821,440; for the Upper Mississippi Valley division, \$8,632,060; for the Great Lakes division, \$1,157,000; for the South Pacific division, \$993,000; and for the North Pacific division, \$1,555,000, a total of \$22,500,000; and the money can be expended just as quickly as it shall be appropriated and the projects put in a position where work can be ordered upon them.

Mr. WAGNER and Mr. SIMMONS addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. JONES. I yield first to the Senator from New York.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Washington if we are to draw the conclusion from what the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] has just said that of this \$150,000,000 proposed emergency appropriation, only \$22,000,000 of it may be used at once for the employment of labor?

Mr. JONES. I can not agree with the Senator as to that. I think \$80,000,000 for road-construction work will be used very promptly, though, of course, the work can hardly start to-morrow.

Mr. WAGNER. We know as a matter of experience that money for public roads can not be expended for a period of seven or eight months after the appropriation shall have been made, because there is required first the approval by the Federal Government of the plans proposed by the States, and after that come all the preliminary steps, which anybody in authority will say will take at least six or seven months.

I do not urge these considerations, Mr. President, in opposition to the proposed legislation; I will vote for it; but I do not believe that the American public ought to be deceived into the belief that this money will be immediately available in order to put men to work. It emphasizes our unpreparedness amidst a depression. It is the very thing which the legislation I proposed a year ago was designed to avoid. If that legislation had been enacted, we would now be all prepared to check the economic depression.

Mr. JONES. I do not know how the Senator's State is; but many of the States have their road plans all ready, and will start work as soon as they get the money.

Mr. WAGNER. All the Senator needs to do is to inquire of those in authority just when this money can be used for the employment of labor. He will learn regretfully no immediate relief will result from these appropriations.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. JONES. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BLACK. May I ask the Senator whether or not the money can be spent in the States where they are not able to match it at the present time, dollar for dollar?

Mr. JONES. It can. That is provided for.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

Mr. JONES. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator, of course, recalls the fact that while we passed a river and harbor bill during the last session of Congress the President did not sign that bill until after adjournment. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. JONES. I do not remember whether it was signed after adjournment or not; but it was signed, all right.

Mr. SIMMONS. It was not signed in time for the Committee on Appropriations to appropriate for any authorizations carried in that bill.

Mr. JONES. No; the appropriation for rivers and harbors had been made for the current year before that bill passed.

Mr. SIMMONS. Therefore no appropriations have been made heretofore by the committee to carry out the authorizations in the rivers and harbors act of the last session.

Mr. JONES. No; but many of the items covered by this \$22,500,000 are items covered by that bill. I do not know whether all of them are covered by it or not; but I know that many of the items in the last rivers and harbors bill are covered in this emergency appropriation of \$22,500,000.

Mr. FLETCHER and Mr. WALSH of Montana addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington yield; and to whom?

Mr. JONES. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. SIMMONS. I desire to call the attention of the Senator to one matter of great importance in my State.

The last river and harbor bill appropriated for the construction of a dam in the inland waterway in the section between Virginia and North Carolina, known as the Currituck Sound Canal, or, I believe, named in the report as the Albemarle and Chesapeake Canal. The authorization was \$5,000,000. That work is going on now, I think, because private interests, being very much damaged by the failure to construct that dam in that canal, are advancing the money; and I understand the Senator to say that some of the items that were authorized in that act are included in this new appropriation that is proposed.

Mr. JONES. They are; and let me say to the Senator that this \$22,500,000 for rivers and harbors does not interfere with the regular river and harbor appropriation. That will be \$60,000,000 for this fiscal year.

Mr. SIMMONS. But there has never been an appropriation for this particular authorization.

Mr. JONES. That may be.

Mr. SIMMONS. In the enumeration of the various rivers and harbors that are covered by the pending bill I understood the Senator from Utah not to mention this canal. In other words, it does not include anything for this canal.

Mr. JONES. I have no doubt but that if this measure does not cover that canal, the \$60,000,000 does make provision for it. I have not looked it up, but I have no doubt about that.

Mr. SIMMONS. What \$60,000,000?

Mr. JONES. The amount carried by the regular appropriation bill for rivers and harbors that will be available the 1st of July.

Mr. SIMMONS. There was none appropriated.

Mr. JONES. Yes; but we will appropriate during this session of Congress that estimate of \$60,000,000.

Mr. SIMMONS. Then the purpose of the Senator is, in the next bill that he now promises will be introduced to enlarge this appropriation, that those items will be taken care of?

Mr. JONES. The Budget estimate for rivers and harbors for the regular current appropriation is \$60,000,000. I have not any doubt but that that will be included in the Army appropriation bill. I have no doubt but that it will be included in the House. If it is not put in there, of course, we

will put it in here. That will be available, then, the 1st of July. I have no doubt but that the Senator's project will be covered by that \$60,000,000.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I am not going to offer any amendment to this bill on account of the assurance given me by the Senator from Washington; but I shall insist that that item be taken care of, and some other items in my State that are not taken care of in this bill at all.

Mr. JONES. This bill was not intended to take care of all the items all over the country, as the Senator knows. That \$60,000,000 will come in later.

Mr. GLASS, Mr. WALSH of Montana, and Mr. SWANSON addressed the Chair.

Mr. JONES. I yield to the junior Senator from Virginia. I think he rose first.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, I was unavoidably prevented from attending the meeting of the Appropriations Committee this morning; and I realize that any Senator who is cautious enough to propound questions now, and who does not enter into this feverish haste in appropriating the Treasury's money, may be regarded as inimical to the proposals made.

Mr. JONES. Not by me, Mr. President.

Mr. GLASS. Nevertheless, I am going to venture to say that we ought to inform ourselves. We ought not to fool either ourselves or the country.

For example, we have here an appropriation of \$80,000,000 for the prosecution of good-roads work, and we are given to suppose that that money will be immediately available or available within the next few months. That is not so at all, Mr. President. Many of the States have biennial sessions of their legislatures. The States are required under existing law to match the appropriations of the Federal Government. Take my State: We have biennial sessions of the legislature, and the General Assembly of Virginia does not convene until next December. So there is no opportunity in the world for the State to match the appropriations of the Federal Government; and, failing to match the appropriations of the Federal Government within a given time, the money allocated to Virginia will be turned over to some State that has matched them.

Mr. JONES. No, Mr. President; the Senator is mistaken. There is an express provision in this bill that where the State has exhausted its funds, and so on, part of this \$80,000,000 may be advanced to the State, to be repaid afterwards; so that there will be no delay at all on that account.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GLASS. Just a moment, and then I shall desist. Another thing that occurs to me is this: We have had so many measures of farm relief that have not relieved anybody but have taxed and burdened all classes of people that I am getting to be a little dubious about measures of farm relief.

For example, there is an existing supposition that we are to relieve the farmers of the country by speeding up the construction of good roads. There is not a more fallacious supposition on the face of the globe, because when you strip the farm of all of its available labor by the enticing wage prices that prevail in the construction of good roads you do not relieve the farm. You damage the farmer. You may relieve a few farm hands by stripping the farms of all available labor, but I would not call that a measure of farm relief.

We are just going ahead imagining things. For example, the administration gave out a statement from the White House, pretty soon after the collapse in New York, that the captains of industry and the business men of the country had there assembled, and that there would be no reduction in the number of laborers, and there would be no reduction in the wage scale. The standard was to be kept up. The Department of Commerce the other day issued a report showing that 161 railroads alone had reduced the number of their employees 261,000 since last September, and everybody knows that there have been wage reductions all along the

line. It seems to me we are just getting into a fever of haste to apply remedial legislation that is not going to remedy anything.

Mr. JONES. It has not occurred to me that this is a farm relief bill. This is largely an unemployment bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, if we can not get a vote on this bill now, since the Senator from Tennessee gave notice yesterday that he desired to address the Senate, I feel that I should yield the floor and let him make his speech.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me for a moment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington yield the floor?

Mr. JONES. I yield the floor now.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I want to recur, if the Senator from Washington will give me his attention, to the matter presented by the Senator from Arkansas concerning the availability of these funds after the expiration of the present fiscal year.

We have now taken out the language on page 1, "during the remainder of the fiscal year 1931 with a view to increasing employment, namely"; but is it not a fact that if the appropriation is not exhausted during the current fiscal year it will automatically cease, and not thereafter become available? Is not that the rule in case of all appropriations? And in order to effect the purpose of the Senator from Arkansas, if the Senator from Arkansas will give me his attention, will it not be necessary to add "to remain available until expended"?

Mr. JONES. I think possibly that is true. I shall be glad if the Senator will offer that amendment.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I offer that amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana offers an amendment, which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the bottom of page 1 it is proposed to insert:

To remain available until expended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR obtained the floor.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HEFLIN. In order to have some definite plan about the expenditure of this money, I offer the following amendment:

Add a new section at the end of section 3, on page 4, as follows: "Be it further enacted, That the funds provided for in this bill shall be made available for use on the projects herein named within 30 days after the passage of this act."

I do not want any action taken on that amendment until the Senator from Tennessee has finished his speech.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be considered as pending.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. For what purpose?

Mr. BLAINE. I am not going to make a speech. I want to offer an amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Can not the Senator offer the amendment just a little later?

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is one amendment pending now.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. If it is just for a question.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The Senator from Tennessee, I believe, is a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I wish to inquire of the Senator if it is not a fact that annually there is included

in the Army appropriation bill an item for river and harbor work recommended by the engineers of the Army?

Mr. McKELLAR. There is.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. It is proposed this year that that item shall be separately adopted. There was an item in last year's bill, as there is in the bill of every year. In addition to that, by a special act of Congress, there were authorized additional river and harbor works before Congress adjourned last June. Is that true?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is my recollection, but I could not be positive about it.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Is it not a fact that, regardless of any message by the President or any claim of emergency, we would have to appropriate this money anyway to carry out the purpose of a law passed at the last session?

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly. Now, I can not yield further, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Tennessee declines to yield further.

THE PRESIDENT'S STATEMENT ON RELIEF LEGISLATION

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, ordinarily when I make a speech I do so without notes, but to-day I am going to talk about an assault made by the President of the United States on every Member of the Senate of the United States, and in order to be careful I am going to use notes.

Mr. President, on yesterday the President of the United States gave out a statement to the newspapers assailing each and every Member of this body. The cause of his assault was that he had recommended to the Congress an appropriation of \$25,000,000 to be used in lending to the farmer, and he learned that a committee of the Senate had recommended a fund of \$60,000,000 for that purpose and that the Senate was likely to accept it. Thereupon he gave out to the papers this assault upon the Senate, and each and every one of its Members, because each and every one of its Members voted for the joint resolution which contained the authorization of the \$60,000,000 instead of the \$25,000,000 as advocated by the President.

Mr. President, this assault was unprovoked, unjustifiable, unconstitutional, and untrue in fact. The Constitution of the United States, Article II, section 3, provides as follows:

He [the President] shall from time to time give to the Congress information of the state of the Union, and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient.

In other words, the Constitution provides specifically how the President may transact his business with the Congress. Under well-known rules of law the expression of one method in the Constitution is the exclusion of others. The President evidently desired that the Senate should know that he disapproved of the \$60,000,000 resolution. Instead of sending a message to the Senate, expressing his disapproval, he takes the undignified, unconstitutional, and angry way of running to the newspapers with his statement. Of course, I do not know that the President ever read the Constitution, and if he is ignorant of its terms, then he can not be criticized so severely, but it does seem to me that when he wants to advise the Congress he should pursue constitutional methods and send his message to the Congress direct. His denunciation of the Senate and of Senators in this way is certainly unbecoming to the dignity of the high office which he holds for the moment.

RAIDS UPON THE TREASURY

In his tirade of abuse upon Members of the Senate for appropriating a larger sum for the benefit of the farmers of the country the President says:

Prosperity can not be restored by raids upon the Public Treasury.

Thus he accuses every Senator who voted for the \$60,000,000 appropriation, when he had recommended only twenty-five million, of being guilty of raiding the Treasury in the interest of the farmers of the country. With all due respect to the President, I say that his statement is untrue in fact. The joint resolution passed yesterday does not constitute a raid upon the Treasury. The figure carried in it

was arrived at after the most careful examination by a committee of the Senate composed of men of the highest type and distinction, men whose training, whose judgment, whose desire to serve the people, whose responsibility toward the people, whose knowledge of the subject are infinitely greater than those of Mr. Hoover, who has had painfully small experience with farmers, and whose every attitude toward the farmers has either been one of opposition, or, as in the case of the farm bill, dictated by him last spring, utter incapacity to deal with the farm problem.

THE PRESIDENT'S RECORD OF RAIDS

Mr. President, denying absolutely that the passage of the measure on yesterday providing for a fund of \$60,000,000 was a raid upon the Treasury, I want to call the attention of the Senate and of the country to the fact that even if it constituted a raid upon the Treasury, the President is the last man in the United States, in view of his record on the subject of raids upon the Treasury, to call attention to that fact.

I have before me his message to the Congress, and notably his Budget message of December 1, 1930. He has made recommendations as to appropriations for special and favored interests that are infinitely more to be classed as raids upon the Treasury than the amount provided for by the Senate to be loaned to the farmers. I am going to take some of these up.

THE PRESIDENT'S SHIPPING BOARD RAID

In his message of December 1 the President recommended to the Congress that it appropriate \$35,000,000, to be known as the Shipping Board construction fund, such \$35,000,000 to be loaned out to large shipping interests at nominal rates of interest so that they can build ships and make money for themselves. The President has already recommended or approved the sale of the Government's ships to these same shipping interests at nominal prices, ships owned by the Government. After conferring this legalized graft upon the shipping interests, he has recommended the making of contracts with these same interests for carrying the mails, which are nothing more than subsidies of many millions a year more, and in the end obligating the Government in such enormous sums for these subsidies that I have no doubt it will soon develop into a national scandal.

So what will the President call his recommendation of \$35,000,000 and contracts obligating the Government for hundreds of millions more for ship subsidies? What is that to be called? Is it a raid on the Treasury?

Does the President distinguish between the beneficiaries of raids? Where legislation is passed for the farmers of the country, does he call that a raid, whatever the amount, but when the same kind of bills appropriating and obligating the Government to the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars for a special interest, an interest which needs no help at this time, are passed, what does he call that? He has called this farmers' measure a raid upon the Treasury.

I come to the next raid recommended by Mr. Hoover, known as the "gamblers' tax raid." A little more than a year ago there was a collapse of the stock market in New York. A great many men and women who had been gambling on the market lost large sums, just as gamblers invariably do sooner or later. It makes no difference where the scene of their operations, when they gamble, it is inevitable that losses shall come.

Let me call attention to the fact that none of these gamblers in the Wall Street collapse were in want, none of them faced starvation, as many of our farmers do. But what did the President do for them? Ah, the President was very tender of them! He recommended a reduction of taxes applying largely to this class of our people, amounting to \$160,000,000, this recommendation being made in their interest. The President did not regard that as a raid, yet what he did was to take away from the Treasury of the United States money that ought not to have been taken in any such enterprise.

INCREASE OF NAVY RAID

I want to call to the special attention of those who believe that the United States should have only a very small Navy the "increase of Navy raid" as given in the President's Budget message of December 1.

The President has been attempting to make people believe that he is in favor of reduction of naval armament. He brought about the celebrated London conference. I suppose we have sunk already a number of vessels in accordance with the agreement made in that congress. Yet the President comes blandly along on December 1 and recommends to the Congress an appropriation of \$49,400,000. To be used for what? To be used for building ships, war vessels, in place of those which were sunk under the London conference.

By one agreement he sinks a portion of the Navy of the United States, and then by another recommendation he seeks to build additional ships. Who profits more than anyone else, Mr. President, by the sinking of ships under the system of sinking and rebuilding? It is the Steel Trust, shipbuilding people, the big interests of this country, that profit by such a system! How indefensible must be the position of the President who makes a contract in London to sink a portion of our Navy in the interest of peace and disarmament and then instantly comes before the Congress and recommends an increase of the Navy by the expenditure of \$49,400,000 for building up another Navy in its stead.

Raid on the Treasury? If ever there was an indefensible raid on the Treasury, that piece of business constitutes that kind of a raid.

REFUND OF TAXES

I come to another raid on the Treasury which has been going on for years, and Mr. Hoover is keeping it up.

Oh, yes! The President gets angry with the Members of the Senate. He assaults the Members of the Senate. He denounces the Members of the Senate. All for adding \$35,000,000 to the appropriation recommended for the farmers of the United States in their distressed condition, in their oftentimes starving conditions. But he is more gentle and kind when it comes to the great, rich, powerful classes in this country who need no help.

Last year he recommended \$130,000,000 to be largely refunded to the rich war profiteers who made their great fortunes out of the war, who paid their taxes during the war, and now, under Mr. Hoover's administration, those taxes are being refunded to the great profiteering interests of the country; \$130,000,000 refunded last year, and some hundred millions this year, with deficiency bills still to be passed. If ever any proposed legislation constitutes a raid upon the Treasury, it is this system of legalized graft by which war taxes have been refunded. More than two billions of dollars have been refunded in the last 10 years. Oh, yes! Refund these taxes to the rich and the powerful and the influential, says Mr. Hoover. Give them \$130,000,000 a year; but when farmers are in distress, when farmers are facing starvation, it is a raid upon the Treasury to lend them the money with which to buy seed to make another crop.

The gifts to the great income-tax-paying classes of our population are gifts outright from the Treasury. It is being done secretly. No man can say how it is being done or whether it is being done fairly and justly or not, because it is being done behind closed doors, and not even the most meager information is given out, but there are no strings attached to that. These riches come from the Treasury with a perfect title, and they have the full approbation of the President. But, oh! what a horrible thing it is to increase the fund recommended by him for the purpose of lending the farmers so they can make a crop after nature has devastated them.

Mr. President, I have kept up with the system of tax refunds carried on by the Government since 1921, and I want to say it is the most indefensible system of legalized graft ever constituted in any nation under the sun. In the way of refunding of money and depletions it has amounted to over \$4,000,000,000 in the last 10 years. But it

goes to the ruling classes, and therefore it meets the President's absolute approval; but when the Senate adds \$35,000,000 to the appropriation recommended by the President for the farmers he denounces it, he denounces every Senator who votes for it, and he assaults the Senate as a body.

THE FARM BOARD

I next come to the raid upon the Treasury known as the Farm Board raid. The President has recommended that \$150,000,000 be turned over to the Farm Board. What for? Apparently the only purpose is to permit that board to engage further in gambling with farm products. That board has been a complete failure. It has not done the farmer a particle of good. It has spent hundreds of millions of the people's money without any returns. Prices of everything that the farmer makes have been constantly going down since that board has been in existence. It is putting up the people's money in the gambling business and the President recommends that we give them another \$150,000,000 with which to gamble. I was told by a member on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry that Mr. Legge stated the other day before that committee that the Farm Board absolutely controlled the wheat market—and I invite the especial attention of the Senators from the wheat sections of the country to this statement—that they could put the price up or put the price down, and the reason they did not put the price up was because they wanted the millers to buy and manufacture wheat into flour at the present price so as to make bread cheaper to the consuming public.

Why, Mr. President, everyone knows that there is a spread of 70 per cent between the cost of the raw material and the price for which the baker sells his bread. Only 30 per cent goes to the wheat farmer, and yet here is the chairman of this board stating to a committee of the Senate that the board now controls the price of wheat and are controlling it downward so as to allow the miller to manufacture flour to sell bread cheaper. Everybody knows that the price of bread has no relation or very little relation to the price of wheat. Under this administration the price of wheat does not affect the cost of bread to the consumers. Oh, yes, the President is willing to recommend \$150,000,000 for the Farm Board to gamble on the future markets in the interest of the millers apparently, but he is willing to lend the farmers but \$25,000,000 in order to help them make a crop next year. That same Senator told me that Mr. Legge could control the cotton market, and the reason why cotton did not go up was because they wanted the spinners to get cotton at a reasonable price so they could manufacture their goods. Farm Board, indeed! I want to say I will "have to be shown" before I will vote for an appropriation for this incompetent board, this incapable board, this gambling board, this future-market board, this board is being used to crush the farmer rather than to help the farmer, this board whose chairman told the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate that they control the price of wheat and the price of cotton, and the reason why they do not let the prices go up is because in the one instance they want the millers to make more profit and in the other instance the spinners to make more profit. Is that why we constituted the Farm Board? I say that if the Farm Board, this weak board, this incompetent board, is further maintained, it will constitute a raid on the Treasury second to none of the other raids which Mr. Hoover has approved.

OTHER RAIDS

Mr. Hoover has recommended in this message of December 1 more than \$1,320,000 for a National Advisory Commission for Aeronautics, and \$2,000,000 for the Porto Rico Hurricane Commission. Oh, yes; it is perfectly all right to take care of the island of Porto Rico, and I say that it ought to be done, but when the President sees that the farmers of the country and the wage earners of the country are without employment and takes this backhanded, left-handed way of communicating with the Senate, trying to defeat the bill which is before us by giving out an interview in which he virtually denounces as a raider upon the Treasury every Senator in

this body, because every one of us voted for that bill, I say he is going too far.

Mr. Hoover has just recommended \$2,500,000 for entomology, bug hunting, for doing something with bugs, and when the Senate proposes to increase an appropriation to be loaned to the farmers so they can make crops, he denounces and assaults the Senate. He recommends \$1,800,000 for the Bureau of Biological Survey, \$9,200,000 for the Bureau of Aeronautics, a contribution to the great aircraft carriers to help them along. Oh, yes; they need help. Any vested interest needs help. It makes no difference how rich they may be or how much money they have, they can always get from the President a recommendation for help from the Treasury of the United States; but when the unemployed are brought before us, when the farmers of the country are brought before us, when the war veterans are brought before us, see how quickly he begins to defend the Treasury of the United States.

Oh, Mr. President, it is all right to spend \$2,500,000 of the people's money on bugs and over \$10,000,000 in aid of the great air line transportation companies, but we must chide when it comes to lending money to the farmers to make bread and meat for the American people.

All these recommendations are made by the President. They are down in black and white. They include \$50,000,000 for increased ships in the Navy after sinking perfectly good ones, \$2,500,000 for bugs, \$2,000,000 for the starving in Porto Rico—and we ought to have given it—hundreds of millions to the great shipowners, scores of millions to the airplane companies. Oh, yes. But these are wealthy and need no money, so Mr. Hoover is perfectly willing to give them more. But when it comes to the farmers in their pitiful and distressing condition he goes out of his way to come out in an interview denouncing and assaulting the Senate for disagreeing with him about the amount to be loaned to the farmers.

POLITICS

The President denounces the Senate of the United States in these words: "They are playing politics at the expense of human misery." What a damnable charge, Mr. President! It is an absolutely untrue charge and I denounce it as absolutely false without the slightest foundation in fact.

WAGNER UNEMPLOYMENT BILLS

No Senator on this floor has done more, has fought harder, has worked more faithfully in the interest of lessening unemployment than the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. A year ago he introduced bills and sought by every means in his power to do something for the unemployed of the country. He had several bills which passed the Senate and went to the House, but what became of them? The President stepped on them over there. He stopped their consideration. He is still opposed to them. If the President even raised his finger in favor of the Wagner bills in the House, they would, no doubt, pass, and if they passed, his signature would mean they would become the law. Has he done it? Of course, he has not. He is filibustering to this good hour against those worthy unemployment bills.

Talk about playing politics. Who has been playing politics with the unemployment situation in this country? It has been known for a long time that there were millions of American people out of employment. What has the President ever done to stop it? He called a meeting of his rich and powerful friends here in Washington some time after the panic. They came and passed resolutions. They said they would not discharge their employees, and immediately they went home and began to discharge their employees and have been discharging them ever since. Some one stated figures here a few moments ago to the effect that one railroad company alone had already discharged between 155,000 and 200,000 men since its representatives were here and told the President, so he said, that they were not going to discharge any more men.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Confirmatory of what the Senator has said, I have had some statistics presented to me, prepared by the authorities of the Federal bank in Boston, indicating that the pay rolls in New England dropped 28 per cent in the month of November as compared with the month of November a year ago.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have no doubt of it.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. And November a year ago was bad. That gives some idea of the extent of the unemployment in New England.

Mr. McKELLAR. The great manufacturing companies have been discharging their employees, the captains of industry have been discharging their employees, and Mr. Hoover himself, through his various agencies, has been discharging Government employees. They have been discharged or let out in the Post Office Department, in the Navy Department, in the War Department. I remember in Memphis, my home city, some time ago I was reading in the morning paper of the wonderful steps the administration and Mr. Hoover were taking to keep men employed in the Government, and yet that very hour there were representatives of 400 men working for the Government on the levee who had been in my office protesting against having been discharged the day before. When I inquired into it, I was told that orders had been received from Washington to discharge these men, and the best assurance I could ever get for them was that they would be restored to a 3-day or 4-day week, so as to give them actual bread. Here was our President or officials under him carrying out his policy discharging Government employees. Yet he talks about doing something for the unemployed.

Mr. President, we have just had reported to us this morning what I suppose will be called the President's unemployment bill. Under the terms of that bill \$110,000,000 are proposed to be appropriated to relieve unemployment, so to speak. There never was a greater misnomer. Of that sum \$80,000,000 go to road projects, some \$22,000,000 go to rivers and harbors, and certain other millions are to be devoted to other projects. None of that money will be spent now. I offered to wager a Senator this very morning that if this bill should pass just as it is written, just as the President sent it down here, just as his friends are advocating that it be passed, it would not give employment to 300 men in his State. I will say to my friend the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], that it will not add 20 men to the employed in his State.

As we all know, the unemployment situation is on us now. The months of January, February, and March will be the worst months. If we are going to do anything for the unemployed, if we are going to keep them from starving, if we are going to keep their families from starving, we ought to furnish work to them during January, February, and March. Unless we do furnish work for them during those months, there is no telling what the consequences will be. That is when they will need help most; that is when they are likely to starve; those are the months when they are likely to be hungry; but the President's plan will not give a dollar to the employment of anybody during those months.

During that time the officials in charge of the public works can not get the plans ready to use a dollar of that \$110,000,000, and all that will be used, if Congress is simple enough to grant it, will be paid out for overhead charges to men and women who do not need help; none of it during the crisis will go to those who are unemployed and who never so badly needed help as they do now; and yet the President is talking about "playing politics."

The \$110,000,000 is to be turned over to him and to his Cabinet without let or hindrance. Who can tell how any of it is going to be spent? The question was asked of my distinguished and beloved friend, the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES], and all he could say was that \$80,000,000 of it was going to be expended on roads somewhere. It may or may not be so expended; I hope it will; but I disagree with the Senator absolutely that any of it will be applied in time to alleviate the present situation of unemployment; at any rate, I believe only a few dollars of it will be so applied; and

I imagine that the whole \$110,000,000 will not provide employment for 5,000 men, certainly for not over 10,000, of the present unemployed men in this Republic; and I understand that there are at least four or five million who are unemployed.

Mr. President, while I am talking about politics let me say that the President of the United States has had some experience in spending Government funds. It will be remembered that upon his suggestion, after the World War was over, Congress in a burst of generosity and upon Mr. Hoover's suggestion, made through President Wilson, appropriated \$100,000,000 for starving people among the Allies in Europe. That fund was turned over to Mr. Hoover to spend. Whether there has ever been a final accounting of the fund I do not know. The last account I saw did not show how the entire sum was expended. It accounted in the most general way for about \$88,000,000. Whether there has ever been another accounting of that fund I do not know, and I doubt if any Senator on this floor knows. If there be any Senator who knows, I ask him to speak now, and I will yield to him to state whether or not Mr. Hoover has ever made a final accounting as to the expenditure of that entire \$100,000,000.

Mr. Hoover bought meats which, for the most part, had been accumulated by the packers of the country and sent those meats abroad. If it had not been for that fund and for Mr. Hoover's purchasing those meats the packers had accumulated, that great store would have had to have been sold to the American people at greatly reduced prices; but the packers sold them to Mr. Hoover to be carried abroad, and the prices of meat were thereby maintained in America.

If there ever was a measure the effect of which aided the great monopoly known as the meat monopoly in this country, that measure recommended by Mr. Hoover was one. It savored much more of a raid on the Treasury than the pitiful amount to be loaned to the farmers of the country in the most dire distress they have ever suffered. Not only did he spend American money, but he kept the price of meats in this country and perhaps in other countries at an abnormal price. I shall have to be shown the accounting of Mr. Hoover for that \$100,000,000 before I vote to turn over to him another \$110,000,000 to be used as he sees fit.

Since preparing that statement I have seen the bill and it does not provide for his using it exactly as he sees fit, and for that reason I shall not fight the bill. O Mr. President, it is "playing politics" when the Senators in Congress seek to have a fund used for the purpose of giving the unemployed work; but the President is "playing no politics" when he asks for \$110,000,000 to be turned over to him and disposed of by his Cabinet.

MR. HOOVER IN NO ATTITUDE TO CRITICIZE

Mr. President, as soon as Mr. Hoover was elected President he began a career of utter disregard of the proprieties in government. He sought and secured a battleship to take him around South America at the Government's expense. He secured it only because the Navy Department no doubt knew that it would be better for it to accede to his wishes in that regard. Such a trip made at Government expense in a Government battleship before he was President was the very height of impropriety.

Is there a man on this floor, if he were elected President, who would commit such an act of impropriety? If so, I should like for him to interrupt me and say so. I take it that no man here familiar with the Government, familiar with the proprieties which should govern officials of the Government, would for a moment think of doing it.

And since the President has undertaken to assail us, since he has denounced us, I think we might as well have another matter cleared up here and now. Another situation that has been open to public talk for a long time is that the President, in buying and building a summer residence, used the marines of the United States in the building of roads and clearing the land, and some even say in building the house. I do not know that this allegation is true. I merely know that it is on the lips of everyone. If it is true, it is an indecent and illegal use of the powers of the President in his control over the United States marines.

Mr. President, the statement given out by the President assailing and denouncing the Senate and its Members is unworthy of the Chief Magistrate of this Nation or of any nation. If he is worthy of his office, he will apologize to the Senate. If he is unworthy, he will not apologize to the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks an editorial entitled "Politics!" from the Washington Daily News of Wednesday, December 10; also an editorial from the Baltimore Sun of December 10 entitled "Asking for It."

There being no objection, the editorials referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of Wednesday, December 10, 1930]

"POLITICS!"

The President wishes to hasten aid for the unemployed. His notion of how to accomplish this is to fire a broadside charge of "Politics!" at all Members of Congress whose ideas on the subject differ from his.

We can think of nothing better calculated to cause delay than the printed outburst handed to the press by the President yesterday. For, naturally, the Congressmen now will take time to answer the President—time that might be used in doing the thing he wants done.

That this will happen seems inevitable. But we hope it doesn't. We hope the Congressmen may overlook the President's ill-advised attack—even his outrageous misuse of figures. By that we refer to his assertion that measures already introduced in Congress would increase his recommendations for the fiscal year by \$4,500,000,000. This is a meaningless figure that can be obtained only by adding together all bills calling for appropriations. The President, of course, knows that when a dozen bills, each calling for \$100,000,000, are introduced by a dozen different Members to accomplish the same thing, that only one such bill is going to get through. The net threat to the Treasury is only \$100,000,000—not twelve times that amount. Yet it is a figure obtained by the latter false assumption that the President uses when he talks about \$4,500,000,000.

Still we trust Congress will not be upset by the President's petulance and that the business of taking care of the present emergency may go speedily forward.

[From the Baltimore Sun of Wednesday, December 10, 1930]

ASKING FOR IT

The President must feel completely baffled. If he does not attempt to lead Congress, he is condemned. If he does attempt to lead Congress, he is repudiated. But he has company. He is no more baffled than a great many citizens who find it hard to understand why, whenever he does get to the point of opening his mouth in his relations with Congress, he must always put his foot in it. Yesterday Mr. Hoover sought to serve an entirely proper purpose. He sought to urge upon Congress a policy of caution in using public funds for relief work. But the measure of absurdity, ineptitude, and provocation Mr. Hoover managed to work into a statement of about 300 words is incredible.

He said the sums he had recommended are the extreme amounts that can be used by the Federal Government in actual relief of unemployment. Quite an assertion! But he went on to say also that these sums are the maximum that can be financed without taxes. So that you get a magical result. Figures selected by President Hoover serve, by some superhuman skill or some legerdemain, the double end of helping everybody who is out of a job that the Federal Government can help, and of stopping short at the exact point beyond which lie new taxes. Having declared that fiscal miracle of his own working, the President proceeded to lecture Congress on taxation. When you lay new taxes, you burden the workers or deprive industry of the ability to give employment. When, as a substitute for taxes, you borrow on bonds, you deprive industry of that much capital for its own use and for employment. So Congress must not go beyond the President's recommendations of relief appropriations. Authority speaks.

Congress and the public are left to understand that by some other miracle of Mr. Hoover's working the special appropriations he proposes to pile on top of the deficit will be met without taxation or without borrowing. It is hardly necessary any longer to argue that Mr. Hoover is not a worker of financial miracles. It is hardly necessary to argue that when he spends more money than the Treasury has he is going to do what any other man would do. He is going to lay new taxes, or he is going to borrow in the market, or he is going to have the Treasury kite along until better times come. Well, is there anybody so stupid as to suppose that you can put off new taxes and avoid borrowing in the open market by kiting along when the special appropriations are those Mr. Hoover favors, but that it is impossible to do so if Congress should add, say, fifty million to the sums favored by Mr. Hoover? We do not suppose there is any such ninny alive. Yet it is that doctrine which Mr. Hoover proclaims at the very moment the Senate is deciding whether to increase one of the appropriations recommended by him. And thereby he not only affronts intelli-

gence everywhere; he convinces Congress that he is misrepresenting it to the Nation. When this is added to his talk about playing politics with human misery—talk broad enough to include all opponents—the dam is broken.

So a \$60,000,000 bill for drought relief hurtles through the Senate instead of the \$25,000,000 that Mr. Hoover favored! Hurtles through without a single Senator on either side standing up to fight for the President. It is a spectacle of futility almost without precedent. Whether any great harm has been done, other than the further churning up of the chaos that marks the relations between President and Congress, can not be said with finality. The House may curtail the amount allotted. Anyway, nobody seems to know how much is needed for drought relief. Mr. Hoover might have been expected, out of the wealth of his experience in relief work, to present a tangible calculation. He did not do so. Instead he first talked in generalities and then issued his worse-than-absurd statement. When in doubt, it is usually a good rule to hold down appropriations. But, after all, the Hoover administration will control the appropriation. The law will not compel expenditures; it will simply authorize the administration to make them.

If it be said that it will be hard to close the door, it should also be said that Mr. Hoover opened it. There is ordinarily very great reluctance to see the Federal Government go into the business of granting direct money assistance to needy citizens. Mr. Hoover is at one with Congress in departing from the rule, and the formal initiative is his. Once you depart it is hard to say where a new line should be drawn. Secretary Hyde's talk about doles, in the event the President's proposals should be enlarged, is hysterical idiocy. If the Government is going to lend money to farmers who are unable to borrow from banks or individuals so that they may buy seed and farm equipment, there is no logical reason why it should not lend them money to buy food while they are planting the seed and using the equipment. It is drivelt to approve one and stigmatize the other. There may be considerations of practical expediency for drawing a line, but neither Mr. Hoover nor Mr. Hyde has stated them simply and directly.

The failure to do that, while such furious energy has been poured into the shallow flood of denunciation, is probably the principal reason for the present state of affairs.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I submit the following figures, which I ask may be appended to my remarks.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Some of the larger cash refunds reported to Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation¹ fiscal year ending June 30, 1930

Name of taxpayer	Address	Refund	Interest
<i>July, 1929</i>			
Baldwin Locomotive Works.....	Philadelphia, Pa.....	\$1,628,106.50	\$500,900.03
General Electric Co.....	Schenectady, N. Y.....	530,818.41	114,877.04
Insurance Co. of North America.....	Philadelphia, Pa.....	188,455.54	71,634.14
Murphy, Margaret, estate of.....	do.....	99,352.71	19,831.07
Mutual Life Insurance Co. of New York.....	New York, N. Y.....	674,286.93	120,214.20
Nolde & Horst Co.....	Reading, Pa.....	349,050.34	145,903.71
United Publishers Corporation.....	New York, N. Y.....	111,572.43	28,342.11
Western United Corporation.....	Aurora, Ill.....	75,946.87	22,573.94
<i>August, 1929</i>			
Allen Property Custodian, Tr. No. 2749, William Schneider.....	Washington, D. C.....	32,029.65	-----
American Pipe & Construction Co.....	Philadelphia, Pa.....	110,798.64	34,216.01
Berger Manufacturing Co.....	Canton, Ohio.....	177,868.07	48,019.79
Black River Woolen Co.....	Ludlow, Vt.....	101,660.07	31,474.24
Bull, A. H., Steamship Co.....	New York, N. Y.....	28,149.44	12,507.99
Carbon Steel Co.....	Pittsburgh, Pa.....	243,584.77	95,935.78
Gans Steamship Line.....	New York, N. Y.....	163,971.67	35,357.71
Marathon Paper Mills Co.....	Rothschild, Wis.....	-----	4,689.57
Nippon Yusen Kaisha.....	New York, N. Y.....	359,436.40	236,258.03
Sprunt, James, estate of.....	Wilmington, N. C.....	119,308.44	62,371.20
Superior Oil Corporation.....	Lexington, Ky.....	82,933.14	38,917.65
Symington Corporation.....	Baltimore, Md.....	176,736.53	93,745.17
Ware Shoals Manufacturing Co.....	Ware Shoals, S. C.....	143,726.59	42,611.77
<i>September, 1929</i>			
Crompton & Knowles Loom Works.....	Worcester, Mass.....	81,056.09	45,105.21
Electric Bond & Share Co.....	New York, N. Y.....	102,854.94	20,780.49
Erie Railroad Co.....	do.....	93,371.22	17,765.79
Los Angeles Gas & Electric Corporation.....	Los Angeles, Calif.....	34,838.38	29,798.12
Manufacturers' Light & Heat Co.....	Pittsburgh, Pa.....	81,005.90	47,369.69
McCord Co. and subsidiary.....	Chicago, Ill.....	101,316.38	63,124.94
Reo Motor Car Co. and subsidiary.....	Lansing, Mich.....	91,508.30	44,772.62
Studebaker Corporation.....	South Bend, Ind.....	106,948.04	14,514.92
<i>October, 1929</i>			
American Linseed Co. and subsidiaries.....	New York N. Y.....	428,185.03	218,094.62

¹ Refunds are reported to the joint committee 30 days prior to payment when the total amount to be refunded and/or credited exceeds \$75,000.

Some of the larger cash refunds reported to Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation fiscal year ending June 30, 1930—Continued

Name of taxpayer	Address	Refund	Interest
<i>October, 1929—Continued</i>			
Balaban & Katz Corporation	Chicago, Ill.	\$34,226.05	
Butler Bros.	do.	\$140,472.00	50,339.91
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy R. R. Co.	do.	140,245.01	531,966.70
Consolidated Coal Co. of St. Louis	St. Louis, Mo.	9,419.90	
Crown Cork & Seal Co.	Baltimore, Md.	180,988.39	71,773.15
Goss Printing Press Co.	Chicago, Ill.	14,313.76	5,595.51
Kolb, Frank C.	Merion, Pa.	21,942.43	
Penfield, Anne W. (Mrs.)	Philadelphia, Pa.	159,782.44	64,663.11
Semet-Solvay Co.	New York N. Y.	152,100.04	54,756.01
Strong, Henry G., estate of	Rochester, N. Y.	114,600.62	18,584.56
Western Union Telegraph Co.	New York N. Y.	129,276.89	19,170.16
<i>November, 1929</i>			
Central Steel Co.	Massillon, Ohio	315,709.47	83,870.60
Eno, Amos F., estate of	New York	289,979.85	130,074.85
Export Leaf Tobacco Co.	do.	90,023.16	53,785.75
Frisk, Henry C., estate of	Pittsburgh, Pa.	86,807.25	49,105.24
Genesee Pure Food Co.	Le Roy, N. Y.	72,666.94	7,164.97
Libby, McNeill & Libby (of Maine)	Chicago, Ill.		72,540.35
Frank J. Mackay Trust	do.	152,522.65	31,759.67
Middle States Oil Co. and subsidiaries	New York N. Y.	357,061.26	96,238.56
Philadelphia Electric Co.	Philadelphia, Pa.	775,023.36	107,898.53
Pittsburgh Steel Co. and subsidiaries	Pittsburgh, Pa.	7,705.42	51,931.32
Southern Pacific Co.	New York, N. Y.		254,306.80
State Mutual Life Assurance Co.	Worcester, Mass.	224,846.53	35,367.85
Steigerwalt, William H., estate of	Philadelphia, Pa.	97,984.35	11,035.99
Travelers' Insurance Co.	Hartford, Conn.	190,261.58	34,531.44
<i>December, 1929</i>			
Air Nitrate Corporation	New York, N. Y.	178,411.97	104,203.85
Allied Chemical & Dye Corporation	do.	34,244.25	43,399.00
American Maize Products Co.	do.	92,311.21	36,766.41
Barber & Co.	do.	89,686.66	57,605.01
Central Steel Co.	Massillon, Ohio	434,256.42	224,284.51
Columbus Dental Manufacturing Co.	Columbus, Ohio	89,673.44	34,483.24
Dodge, Horace E., estate of	Detroit, Mich.	388,820.96	166,782.88
Flinn, William, estate of	Pittsburgh, Pa.	147,823.64	19,289.97
Home Life Insurance Co.	New York	76,007.52	19,784.39
Metropolitan Life Insurance Co.	do.	771,848.64	285,153.50
The Pullman Co.	Chicago, Ill.	642,892.84	238,429.32
Schoonmaker, James M., estate of	Sewickley, Pa.	246,779.94	19,076.42
Tobacco Products Corporation	New York	88,427.11	20,794.90
Utah Power & Light Co.	Salt Lake City, Utah	92,161.95	44,955.53
<i>January, 1930</i>			
Allied Chemical & Dye Corporation	New York, N. Y.		24,630.51
Central Leather Co. and subsidiaries	Kalamazoo, Mich.	194,207.73	56,313.75
Dodge, John F., estate of	Detroit, Mich.	466,900.15	226,734.01
Harkness, Anna M., estate of	New York, N. Y.	190,948.24	21,789.02
Kansas Gas & Electric Co. and subsidiaries	Wichita, Kans.		18,798.48
Philadelphia Co. and subsidiaries	Pittsburgh, Pa.	2,291,617.20	1,117,174.01
Pittsburgh & West Virginia Ry. Co.	do.	107,614.15	35,314.30
Public Service Corporation of New Jersey and subsidiaries	Newark, N. J.	811,023.41	401,912.14
United Publishers Corporation	New York N. Y.	92,115.56	43,612.20
<i>February, 1930</i>			
Advance Rumely Co.	La Porte, Ind.	119,804.88	31,854.69
Acher Daniels Linseed Co.	Minneapolis, Minn.	188,984.57	110,072.87
Berkshire Cotton Manufacturing Co.	Adams, Mass.	86,378.00	34,725.70
Brown, Paul, estate of	St. Louis, Mo.	786,926.35	47,344.94
Cincinnati Milling Machine Co.	Cincinnati, Ohio	86,570.25	42,419.42
Farrel Foundry & Machine Co.	Ansonia, Conn.	84,612.92	51,880.59
Grosvenor-Dale Co.	Providence, R. I.	120,517.73	55,808.55
McLaren, Peter, estate of	Perth, Ontario, Canada	113,945.31	31,430.66
Pacific Coast Biscuit Co.	Seattle, Wash.	88,513.21	6,484.87
Thompson, Mary Clark, estate of	New York, N. Y.	189,770.74	42,012.44
Union Twist Drill Co.	Athol, Mass.	198,762.65	104,514.82
United Fruit Co.	Boston, Mass.	92,443.66	27,626.39
United Fuel Gas Co.	Charleston, W. Va.	809,252.45	207,497.58
United States Steel Corporation and subsidiaries	New York, N. Y.	4,092,382.14	11,112,960.90
Willys Overland Co. and subsidiaries	Toledo, Ohio	677,567.43	66,099.43
F. W. Woolworth Co.	New York, N. Y.	(?)	(?)
<i>March, 1930</i>			
California & Hawaiian Sugar Refining Corporation	San Francisco, Calif.	166,324.68	19,936.53
Clifton Manufacturing Co.	Clifton, S. C.	87,972.22	18,366.90
Eastman Kodak Co. of New Jersey	Rochester, N. Y.	2,542,501.13	873,717.43
Harrisburg Pipe & Pipe Bending Co.	Harrisburg, Pa.	247,628.27	151,791.32
Philadelphia Rapid Transit Co.	Philadelphia, Pa.	160,224.38	353,865.98
Reading Co.	do.		3,493.30

* Unadjusted.

Some of the larger cash refunds reported to Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation fiscal year ending June 30, 1930—Continued

Name of taxpayer	Address	Refund	Interest
<i>March, 1930—Continued</i>			
Rockefeller, John D.	New York, N. Y.	\$356,373.34	\$92,027.81
United States Industrial Alcohol Co.	do.	84,213.67	27,556.78
<i>April, 1930</i>			
Allen Property Custodian (Tr. No. 23907) for (Chemische von Heyden)	Washington, D. C.	334,621.20	
Anderson, Clayton & Co.	Houston, Tex.		41,385.86
Astor, John Jacob	New York, N. Y.	324,395.03	138,841.86
Bankers Life Insurance Co. of Nebraska	Lincoln, Nebr.	176,081.82	64,964.54
Big Four Oil & Gas Co.	Pittsburgh, Pa.	171,710.07	21,641.49
Dartmouth Manufacturing Co.	New Bedford, Mass.	43,909.75	32,914.51
Derschug, John N.	Syracuse, N. Y.	89,144.03	21,002.81
Gillican-Chipley Co. (Inc.)	New Orleans, La.	(?)	(?)
Hepburn, Alonzo Barton, estate of	New York, N. Y.	101,524.27	45,412.60
Kuemmerle, Gustave A., estate of	Philadelphia, Pa.	94,662.89	9,590.29
Prairie Oil & Gas Co.	Independence, Kans.	103,663.85	30,784.20
<i>May, 1930</i>			
Atlantic Refining Co.	Philadelphia, Pa.		8,736.09
Eastern Manufacturing Co. of Maine	Bangor, Me.		5,890.47
Fairbanks, Douglas	Los Angeles, Calif.		12,391.25
Higgins Holding Corp. (Inc.)	New York, N. Y.		18,397.31
Illinois Traction Co.	Champaign, Ill.	12,404.62	87,954.48
John Morrell & Co.	Ottumwa, Iowa		6,043.90
Oceanic Steam Navigation Co. (Ltd.)	New York, N. Y.	158,484.67	88,889.75
Public Service Corporation of New Jersey	Newark, N. J.	141,177.35	25,706.14
Rea, Edith Oliver (Mrs.)	Pittsburgh, Pa.	75,730.88	14,858.61
<i>June, 1930</i>			
Barly, J. W. E., estate of	Louisville, Ky.	77,173.08	11,228.88
Brown-Lipe Gear Co.	Syracuse, N. Y.	139,346.11	71,564.36
Cement Securities Co.	Denver, Colo.	117,430.20	56,101.57
Chile Copper Co.	New York, N. Y.	94,802.91	61,577.34
Continental Can Co. (Inc.)	do.	104,049.67	56,544.07
Corporate Investment Co.	Chicago, Ill.		4,358.06
Great Lakes Coal Mining Co. (New Pittsburgh Coal Co., successor)	Columbus, Ohio	77,675.13	38,328.90
Holland-American Line	New York, N. Y.	64,522.86	42,075.48
Honolulu Consolidated Oil Co.	San Francisco, Calif.	318,812.23	152,079.55
Humble Oil & Refining Co.	Houston, Tex.		67,321.55
International Navigation Co. (Ltd.)	New York, N. Y.	76,817.11	45,338.22
Middle West Utilities Co.	Chicago, Ill.	266,008.05	131,243.93
Singer Manufacturing Co. and subsidiaries	Elizabeth, N. J.	194,022.85	44,625.26
Theta Oil Co.	Chicago, Ill.	201,096.86	68,286.63
Vanderbilt, Wm. K., estate of	New York, N. Y.	242,596.70	126,401.31
Willys Overland Co. and subsidiaries	Toledo, Ohio	225,000.00	17,540.75
Grand total		33,078,649.56	22,617,854.36

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, it is easy to see that the campaign of 1932 is now under way. [Laughter.] It is also quite apparent that our friends on the other side of the aisle have made up their minds that the people of this country are going to demand that the present occupant of the White House shall be renominated, and they are engaged in making campaign material as fast as they can reel it off and the official reporters can take it down.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BINGHAM. I did not interrupt the Senator, and I hope he will not interrupt me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FESS in the chair). The Senator from Connecticut declines to yield.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, if I did not desire to see the business of the session go forward promptly and without any further delay, it would give me great pleasure to reply at length to many of the insinuations which I regret my good friend from Tennessee, with whom I have the most pleasant relations, has seen fit to make in the arduous of his partisanship. One can forgive a great deal, however, during the course of a political campaign, and so I forgive him, even though I am sure that many of the things he has implied and insinuated regarding the President of the United States are not worthy of being placed even in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. President, it has been stated by the Senator who preceded me, and by others, that the President of the United

States committed a grave indiscretion in the statement which he gave out to the newspapers yesterday. Of course, if I were to attempt to reply to that, I would be accused of mere partisanship, while those who have been speaking on the other side would claim that their motives were only those of preserving the dignity of the Senate and were not at all dictated by partisanship. Therefore, Mr. President, without myself attempting to reply, I merely ask that there may be read at the desk an editorial printed this morning in what is generally considered the leading Democratic newspaper in the United States—the New York Times—relating to this subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

IRRESPONSIBLES IN CONGRESS

President Hoover's sharp protest against the extravagant projects with which Congress is already flooded should serve to remind the country of a distinction between his office and theirs. He is at the head of the Government. He is bound by oath to see to it, so far as he is able, that the Republic take no harm. What could be more harmful than laws which would at once bankrupt the Treasury and impose heavy and cruel burdens of taxation upon all citizens? This is the point of the timely warning and rebuke which Mr. Hoover addressed yesterday to those Senators and Representatives who are piling up bills to appropriate a total of \$4,500,000,000 from the Treasury under the guise of giving relief to people out of work or suffering from last summer's drought. Probably the total proposed would be even larger if all the items were added up. If it is not already, it soon will be. There is a perfect rush of Members of Congress to see who can put forward the wildest and most expensive scheme. The President is simply doing his duty in calling a halt.

He bluntly accuses certain Congressmen of "playing politics at the expense of human misery." This does not apply to the responsible leaders of either party. They, as Mr. Hoover points out, are standing for moderate and prudent policies in the matter of grants from the Treasury. But they are in danger of being brushed aside and trampled upon by Members of Congress without responsibility, who desire safely to pose as both more kind-hearted and more generous than their party leaders or the President. That such a stampede into reckless spending of the public money is not an imaginary peril may be seen in yesterday's action by the Senate. Despite the reminders of the President that it would not be safe to go beyond the limit of appropriations recommended by the Executive budget, the bill for aiding drought-stricken farmers was pushed up from \$25,000,000 to \$60,000,000, and in that form passed.

With such an ominous beginning before the eyes of the country it is evident that the President will need, and ought to have, strong support from the outside public in his efforts to keep Congress from making ducks and drakes of our public finance. The firmest kind of backing by popular opinion will be requisite if this threatened rake's progress is to be stayed.

FIVE-DAY WEEK FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, a few days ago I introduced in the Senate a bill (S. 5100) providing for a 5-day week for Government employees. I ask that a statement issued to the press yesterday by Mr. Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, indorsing my proposal, be read at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the statement will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

[From the American Federation of Labor—Official information and publicity service—Released for publication Wednesday, December 10, 1930]

It is most refreshing to know that there are Members of the Congress of the United States who possess a deep sense of appreciation of the seriousness of the unemployment situation and who offer real remedies for the acute economic ills from which the Nation is suffering.

Senator DAVID I. WALSH of Massachusetts proposed two remedies that call for immediate application and acceptance. One provides for a liberal appropriation of governmental funds to be used in relieving hunger, suffering, and distress. The other measure provides for the inauguration of the 5-day work week throughout the Government employment service as an emergency measure designed to open up increasing opportunities for employment.

The American Federation of Labor gives its most hearty and unqualified support to these measures. If increasing distress, intense hunger, and social suffering are to be relieved, funds must be made available. The reports which show widespread unemployment with aggravated distress call for heroic action and practical treatment.

No one can deny that the situation is serious and that it will become more serious during the winter period now approaching.

The 5-day work week is practical and necessary if the opportunities for employment are to be enlarged and increased. It is not an untried experiment. It has been accepted in a very large way and has proven to be an economic and industrial success. The time has arrived when the 5-day work week should be well-nigh universally accepted and established. With our increased and perfected facilities of production it is impossible to find employment, except during peak periods, for all those who make up our laboring population.

The Federal Government should lead, instead of follow, in the inauguration of this economic reform. Senator WALSH has sounded a most constructive legislative note. His measures should be given the support of all classes of people who are actually seeking for a remedy for our acute unemployment situation. Let all those who are deeply touched by the serious situation which prevails throughout the land rally to the support of these constructive measures by petitioning Congress to enact them into law without any unnecessary delay. An emergency exists and it must be met through the enactment of emergency legislation.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I ask that a letter of similar character from the Jewish Sabbath Alliance of America (Inc.) and a press notice of this date be printed in the Record; and that this letter, together with the communication just read, be referred, in the nature of petitions, to the Committee on Civil Service.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, and, together with the preceding statement, referred to the Committee on Civil Service, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, December 10, 1930]

DOAK, SWORN AS SECRETARY, APPROVES 5-DAY WEEK HERE—DISCLOSES HIS LABOR VIEWS AND DECLARES ALL INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES ARE SUSCEPTIBLE OF PEACEABLE SETTLEMENT—GREEN LAUDS WALSH MEASURE

William N. Doak, President Hoover's new Secretary of Labor, is for peaceful settlement of labor disputes and believes in the 5-day week.

This much was learned soon after the successor to JAMES J. DAVIS, now Senator from Pennsylvania, took the oath of office yesterday. Mr. Doak was to have assumed his new duties December 1, but the Cabinet change was delayed pending the consummation of Mr. DAVIS's resignation.

"In my opinion," said Secretary Doak, "there never was nor will there at any future time be any labor dispute that could not or can not be settled through negotiation without resort to conflict; that is, if the parties at interest will reason together and approach their problems in the proper spirit. This conviction is based on more than 20 years' experience as a representative of employees without having actually to engage in labor warfare."

Emphasizing that he is authorized to act as mediator and name conciliators in labor clashes, Mr. Doak said he would embrace the first opportunity to assist in settlement of the Danville, Va., strike of textile workers.

That Secretary Doak, Senator WALSH of Massachusetts, and William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, are as one on the advocacy of a 5-day working week also was evidenced yesterday.

The Secretary said, however, that his department can do nothing about it, adding that "the gentlemen on the hill look after fixing the hours of labor here."

NEW YORK CITY, December 9, 1930.

HON. DAVID I. WALSH,

Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The undersigned, as president of the Jewish Sabbath Alliance of America, takes pleasure in communicating with you in regard to the bill which it is stated in the press you are about to introduce in the Senate. I desire to congratulate you most sincerely on this move and trust that it will find immediate and unanimous acceptance.

The Jewish Sabbath Alliance of America has been advocating a 5-day working week for many years. The undersigned proposed a movement for the bringing about of such a shortened working week at the National Convention of the Lord's Day Alliance, held in Oakland, Calif., in 1915. I was, I believe, the first to make this suggestion which was entirely new and unheard of at the time. But since then the idea has spread like wildfire and there is every prospect of it soon becoming the universal practice in this country and perhaps in the entire civilized world. My advocacy of it was based mainly on the religious and sociological grounds, as you will see from a perusal of the inclosed booklet which I am taking the liberty of sending you. But at the present time two additional mighty factors have arisen to make the adoption of the 5-day week imperative—overproduction and unemployment—both of which will be greatly lessened by its universal adoption.

I agree with you most thoroughly that employees of the Government be entitled to the shorter working week and that the adoption thereof will be a great blessing to the so-called "white collar" class whose opportunity of employment will be greatly increased thereby. The Government should have long since adopted the 5-day working week for another weighty reason. In order to be absolutely fair and impartial as between the various elements of our citizenry some of whom observe Sunday and others Saturday as holy time. That all necessary work and serv-

ices can be performed in five days of the week is convincingly shown by the educational system which has had the 5-day week for many years and has found that it is entirely practicable and in no way interferes with effective work.

The Jewish Sabbath Alliance of America will do whatever is in its power to assist you by endeavoring to arouse public sentiment in favor of the proposal by appealing to leading organizations to indorse the same.

Congratulating you again on this very timely and practical proposal which will undoubtedly do much to alleviate present difficult conditions, and wishing all success in realizing it, I remain,

Very truly yours,

BERNARD DRACHMAN,

President Jewish Sabbath Alliance of America (Inc.).

APPROPRIATIONS FOR EMERGENCY CONSTRUCTION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 14804) making supplemental appropriations to provide for emergency construction on certain public works during the remainder of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, with a view to increasing employment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN].

Mr. JONES. I ask to have the amendment read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk has not the amendment of the Senator from Alabama. Will the Senator send it to the desk?

Mr. HEFLIN. I will read it, Mr. President.

I move to add a new section on page 4, at the end of section 3, so that it will read:

Be it further enacted, That the funds provided for in this bill shall be made available for use on the projects herein named within 30 days after the passage of this act.

Making the funds available, of course, does not mean that they must be taken out and used; but the discussion here has developed the idea that it may be that some of this money will not be expended for months, and perhaps none of it will be expended during that time. This situation is rather acute, and I think is entitled to immediate consideration. The adoption of my amendment will make this money available so that wherever the Government sees that the distress is acute it can go to the rescue immediately.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield.

Mr. JONES. May I suggest to the Senator from Alabama that I understand that all the money appropriated by this bill will be available immediately upon its signing by the President. This is not a regular annual appropriation bill.

Mr. HEFLIN. I understand that; but the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] suggested that it might not be expended for some four or five months.

Mr. JONES. Does the Senator want to require it to be expended within 30 days?

Mr. HEFLIN. Not unless it is necessary; but where people are starving, out of employment, and need something to do in order to have something to live on, the sooner we can get to them the better it will be, if it were to-morrow.

Mr. JONES. Of course that is true; and that is the reason why this money will be immediately available upon the approval of the bill by the President. Does the Senator desire that if it is not spent in 30 days it shall lapse?

Mr. HEFLIN. Oh, no.

Mr. JONES. That would be the natural inference from the Senator's language.

Mr. HEFLIN. My proposition is that it be made available within 30 days. That would be the next day.

Mr. JONES. It is available immediately upon the signing of the bill by the President.

Mr. HEFLIN. With the assurance of the Senator that that provision is in the bill, that that is his construction of it, I withdraw my amendment.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to add, at the end of line 25, on page 2, the following proviso:

Provided further, That the balance of the appropriation of \$1,660,000 now unpaid to the State of Alabama, appropriated for the relief of the State of Alabama as a reimbursement or contribution in aid induced by extraordinary floods, shall be paid to the authorities of that State without the requirement that the State match said expenditure except in the manner provided herein.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, I can explain my amendment very briefly so that I believe the Senator from Washington will accept it.

This amendment does not increase the appropriation a dollar. The appropriation was made last year. It would be available now if the State were in condition to match the expenditure. The State has matched a part of the expenditure, but it is not able at the present time, and probably will not be able without the submission of a constitutional amendment for a long period of months, to match this additional expense. All this amendment would do is to make that money available for building roads at the present time and adopt the provision in the Senator's bill that would require it to be matched at a later date. So it does not deprive the Government of anything at the present time, but it would release the money immediately.

The State of Alabama is ready to proceed with the work, but unfortunately is not able now to provide the funds necessary to match this money which was appropriated by the last Congress.

I should like to ask the Senator to agree to accept the amendment, because it does not add anything to the expense, and simply makes the money available for use now, with the provision that it shall be matched later.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I do not feel that we should encumber the bill with particular items with reference to particular States. I will say to the Senator that I am willing to take the amendment to conference and do the best I can with it in conference; but I can not give the Senator very strong assurance of favorable action. I will, however, do the best I can.

Mr. BLACK. If the Senator feels that way, I am sure the Senate would vote for this measure, because there is an extraordinary situation with reference to this particular fund.

Mr. JONES. I say, I am ready to take the amendment to conference and do the best I can; but we can not delay this bill very much.

Mr. BLACK. I understand that, and I would not want the bill delayed; but I feel sure that if it is necessary to make the position of the amendment stronger, the Senate would vote for it now.

Mr. HEFLIN. I understand the Senator from Washington to say that he will accept the amendment.

Mr. JONES. I am ready for the Senate to take a vote on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BLACK].

On a division, the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, I merely wish to ask a question of the chairman of the committee, who is in charge of the bill, regarding the provision on page 2 that is intended to empower the Government to make advances for the construction of highways by States which are not able at the present time to match the expenditures. I desire to ask the Senator if I am correct in my interpretation that immediately upon the passage of this bill the highway department may advance money to the States to carry on such projects as otherwise would be entitled to Federal aid if the States were able to match the Federal appropriation?

Mr. JONES. I think so. That is my understanding.

Mr. CARAWAY. And then the State may refund to the Federal Government within five years?

Mr. JONES. It is not exactly a case of the State refunding it. The United States will pay itself out of the appropriations to the States.

Mr. CARAWAY. That is the idea. In other words, for instance, if my own State should get a million dollars now which it can not match, within five years there will be

charged against it the equivalent of the amount that it gets now?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. CARAWAY. But it may get money now to carry on where it has not the funds to match it?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, after line 7, it is proposed to insert the following:

For the construction and improvement of forest highways, \$3,000,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I desire to direct the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to the last paragraph on page 3 of the report submitted by the House Committee on Appropriations on this bill, which reads as follows:

The recommendation of \$3,000,000 for the construction of roads and trails in national forests can be used immediately and effectively for such purposes in development and protection of the approximately 160,000,000 acres of forest reserves. The improvement work of this character in national forests should not be confused with the forest-highway projects customarily appropriated for under a separate statute providing \$12,500,000 annually. The roads and trails contemplated under this appropriation are forest improvements, very inexpensive in character, costing an average of \$1.150 per mile for roads and \$140 per mile for trails and the expenditure is very largely for labor. The roads are interior roads not surfaced and are used for administrative and fire-fighting purposes. The appropriation does not contemplate any expenditure other than for the roads and trails.

Mr. President, each year Congress has appropriated the equivalent of 10 per cent of whatever the general Federal-aid appropriation might be for the construction of roads in or adjacent to the national forests. If the Federal-aid appropriation was \$75,000,000, then the forest appropriation was seven and one-half million. If it was one hundred million, the forest appropriation was ten million. That sum of money, when appropriated for use in the national forests, is divided into two funds, the forest-development fund and the forest-highway fund.

This bill adds money to the forest-development fund to the extent of \$3,000,000, but does not add one cent to the forest-highway fund. It is utterly inconceivable to me that the Federal Government, having been engaged in the construction of forest highways since the passage of the first Federal highway act, can not now have ready plans and specifications whereby men can be put to work immediately on forest highways.

I ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations if he will not be willing to accept this amendment and take it to conference. All that I ask is that he inquire of the Bureau of Public Roads as to how much money can be properly expended during the next construction season—that is, between now and next November—for this purpose. If the appropriation is fixed at that figure, it will be entirely satisfactory to me.

I admit that the figure of \$3,000,000 is an approximation. I do not know whether it is right or not. But certainly if the major portion of the regular forest fund goes to forest highways, the Department of Agriculture ought to be able to use as much money for immediately promoting that work as is used for the construction of roads and trails from the forest-development fund.

I am sure that the chairman of the committee when he takes this item to conference will have no difficulty in obtaining accurate information as to whether or not it is possible to give prompt employment to labor by providing money for this purpose.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I will be glad to take this to conference and look into the situation very carefully. I will do the very best I can.

Mr. HAYDEN. I ask for the adoption of the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arizona. The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I think I have a very definite opinion as to certain provisions of this bill, about which I am now going to make some inquiries of the Senator from Washington.

Eighty million dollars is to be made immediately available for the construction of highways. I find that there is some confusion of opinion, although I have none myself, as to whether this \$80,000,000 will be that much in addition to the amount already authorized or already appropriated for highways.

Mr. JONES. As I understand it, this is in addition to that. There is a provision here that the \$80,000,000 must be reimbursed after five years.

Mr. SIMMONS. But reimbursed how; out of moneys heretofore provided?

Mr. JONES. It reads:

Provided, That the sums so advanced shall be reimbursed to the Federal Government over a period of five years, commencing with the fiscal year 1933, by making deductions from regular appropriations from future authorizations.

In other words, it will not actually come out of the money of the States, but will come from authorizations for future appropriations to which they otherwise would be entitled under the general highway act.

Mr. SIMMONS. Then \$80,000,000 is made immediately available, and that \$80,000,000 is ultimately to be subtracted from the amounts which would be hereafter appropriated or have been appropriated for roads?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. SIMMONS. It is only authorizing that much money to be used now?

Mr. JONES. That is correct.

Mr. SIMMONS. Suppose a State is entitled to \$3,000,000 for this fiscal year; suppose that to be its proportion.

Mr. JONES. Under the general highway act?

Mr. SIMMONS. Under the general highway act. Suppose its proportion under this measure would be \$2,000,000. Then that State would get \$5,000,000 for this fiscal year?

Mr. JONES. I think so.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, the questions which the Senator from North Carolina has propounded have attracted my attention.

This bill has been heralded throughout the country by the President, or by Federal officials under the administration, as a hundred and ten million dollar Federal relief fund. I want to undertake to debunk that effort, and to show the hypocrisy, not only of the President but of those who are speaking for him, with respect to what the President proposes as Federal aid during this emergency period.

I have no doubt the President intended to convey the idea that the Federal Government proposes to appropriate out of the Federal Treasury \$110,000,000, which fund will be entirely lost to the Federal Treasury. I have no doubt the President would like to have the people of this country believe that to be the case. So I am going to discuss this question at the risk of the President's denunciation.

Here is an appropriation bill carrying only \$30,000,000 as a permanent appropriation out of the Public Treasury of the United States. As the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, has just indicated, the larger portion of this appropriation, \$80,000,000 out of the \$110,000,000, is to be charged against the State governments, and those State governments are to repay that \$80,000,000 within five years through a system of deductions with respect to future, contemplated Federal aid. Yet the President of the United States and those acting under him have never indicated otherwise than that the Federal Government was going to pay out of the public funds, the Public Treasury of the United States, \$110,000,000, without any reservation or qualification, and without any statement that any portion of that fund was to be returned to the Public Treasury or covered into the Public Treasury by the States.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BLAINE. I yield.

Mr. DILL. What part of this \$80,000,000 will it be possible to spend on road work in the United States before the spring weather comes next year, in the Senator's opinion?

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, I have had some experience with reference to the matter about which the junior Senator from Washington has inquired. I know, as every other Senator who comes from Northern States, which are ice-bound from four to five months a year, knows that it is utterly impossible in those States to expend a single dollar on highway construction while the ground is frozen solid.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BLAINE. I yield.

Mr. COUZENS. I think I must take exception to what the Senator has said. For example, in our State we are going ahead grading and building bridges, even all through the winter months, and we are probably just as much icebound and frozen up as is the State of Wisconsin.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, I am quite certain that the Senator's State will not get very far in grading highways in the State of Michigan when the frost goes down 18 inches to 2 feet. It might be possible, by using a large amount of fuel, to thaw out the ground for the purpose of building the smaller culverts and bridges. I said that not a dollar could be expended in the construction of a public highway. I referred to the highway proper. I appreciate that there will be a possibility of expending a few dollars, but only sparingly can there be an expenditure, and whatever there is will be for bridges and culverts. That is the experience of States where the frost grips the earth for several months. So, from a practical standpoint, only a very small amount of this \$80,000,000 can be expended upon the highways in those States before next spring.

Moreover, Mr. President, I regard this provision as a direct insult to every State in the Union. Here is a provision, not to aid or bring relief in the present emergency, but a provision for the appropriation of \$80,000,000 in the nature of loans to the States for the purpose of highway construction. Those \$80,000,000 are to be covered into the Public Treasury of the United States within the next five years, and I have no doubt that if this bill passes in the present language the President of the United States and his political henchmen will broadcast through this land that the administration has come to the aid of starving men and women, in this particular instance by the appropriation of \$80,000,000 out of the United States Treasury. It is not a gratuity at all; it is simply a tender of a loan of money to the respective States. And what does it do? It may be used for a certain specified time, a limited time. Thereafter for five years the amount to which a State would be entitled under the law will be reduced every year. So, instead of encouraging and promoting employment, the result of this bill, if passed, will be to bring on greater unemployment in the succeeding years even than we have to-day. That will be the tendency. Of course, it will not be the main cause of future unemployment, but it will be one of the factors making for unemployment.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BLAINE. In just a moment. My purpose in addressing myself to this bill at this time was to take off this mask of hypocrisy. I am not surprised that the President of the United States, Mr. Hoover, offered the denunciation which he did on yesterday. I am not surprised that a mediocre-minded politician presently occupying the Executive chair, would stoop to denunciation of the character contained in the President's statement.

Two years ago, in 1928, Mr. Hoover was touted all over this country as a great engineer, a superior man, a superman. He was overtouted. The experience of two years of his administration has now demonstrated that his engineering capacity is not that of a great hydraulic engineer or a great mining engineer or a great engineer of any known type. We were not told what kind of an engineer he is. But as some Member of the Senate in the cloak room suggested a few moments ago, when he wrote the denunciatory document which he issued yesterday his fountain pen must have

been filled with gas. I think the comment is pertinent, his engineering experience apparently has been limited to that of a gas engineer.

Mr. President, I thought that it would not be beside the question to call the attention of the Senate, and perchance the attention of the country, to the President's clever manipulation whereby he would acquire credit for the relief of human misery.

Believing as I do, I offer the following amendment: On page 2, line 10, strike out the word "a" and in the same line strike out the words "advance of," and all of lines 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18 down to and including the word "further" in line 18.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 10, strike out the word "a" and the words "advance of," and strike out all of lines 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18 down to and including the word "further" in line 18, so as to make the paragraph read:

Federal-aid highway system: For apportionment to the several States under the provisions of the Federal highway act, as amended, as temporary funds to meet the provisions of such act as to State funds required on Federal-aid projects, \$80,000,000: *Provided*, That the amounts advanced in consequence hereof shall be limited in each case to the sum actually paid out by a State under such advance for work performed before September 1, 1931, for the construction of Federal-aid projects: *Provided further*, That should any State fail to claim any part of its allotment hereunder the President may reapportion such unclaimed funds to States capable of using them prior to September 1, 1931.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the question on the three amendments will be taken by one vote.

Mr. BLAINE. If that amendment be adopted, then we strike out the provision requiring the States to repay the \$80,000,000 within the next five years through this system of deduction. Moreover, Mr. President, we will then have an appropriation out of the Public Treasury of the United States of \$80,000,000 toward highway construction. How far it will go to aid the unemployed I do not know, but the proposal to appropriate \$80,000,000 and impose that burden alone on the States of the Union is unfair. It is not aid by the Federal Government. It is a system of coercion against the States, with the Federal Government or those administering the Federal Government desiring to take credit under the guise of an appropriation for aid of the unemployed.

Mr. President, when we legislate here let us at least legislate honestly. Let us take off the mask. Let us exhibit to the keen eyes of the country these pretenses and hypocrisy in respect to the present situation and the proposals for Federal relief.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. BLAINE. I yield.

Mr. KING. I have a good deal of sympathy with the suggestion made by the Senator that this might be regarded as coercive of the States, requiring them to duplicate the amount and extending the time of repayment for five years. I was wondering what the situation would be if it were an outright appropriation. Would it interfere with the States? Would it be expended solely by the Federal authorities or would it be put into the fund where there is a like amount from the States and expended in the same manner and under the same control and by the same authorities as moneys are now expended appropriated jointly by the Federal Government and by the States?

Mr. BLAINE. If the amendment I have proposed is agreed to, the \$80,000,000 will be distributed and expended in identically the same manner as is the present Federal-highway-aid money, with the limitation or restriction, if it is a restriction, with respect to which the Senator from Arkansas proposed an amendment, and that was the time within which it may be expended. Otherwise it would be identically the same as regular Federal aid for highways.

Mr. KING. Of course if the amendment were adopted it would be tantamount to a modification of the present system under which the States make a contribution of 50 per cent

or thereabouts to match the contribution made by the Federal Government.

Mr. BLAINE. It would be temporarily supplemental to the present Federal highway aid.

Mr. KING. Does not the Senator think that the effect might be to encourage some of the States, if not all, to saddle upon the Federal Government an increasing proportion of all contributions for highways? I have in mind the fact that measures have been introduced—I am not sure whether at this session, but I think so—requiring the Federal Government to build post roads, to build rural roads practically to every farm in the United States. I wonder whether this might not be an encouragement to the States to demand that the Federal Government assume entire responsibility for roads which are used as post roads by rural carriers, and to result in agitation by the States to transfer to the Federal Government the obligation to maintain highways within the States?

Mr. BLAINE. I think not. This is merely intended as temporary aid and is so understood, and I have no doubt will be so understood. Moreover, the respective States spend all the way from ten to almost twenty times as much in highway construction as does the Federal Government. I doubt if there is a State in the Union which presently is without money to meet this proposed \$80,000,000 additional aid. I am quite certain, from my study of the schedules which were presented by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. BROOKHART] a few days ago respecting the expenditures for public highways, that every State in the Union presently to-day has more money than is necessary not only to meet the permanent highway aid but as well this proposed temporary highway aid.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. BLAINE. I yield now to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. In the interest of complete truth respecting that particular point, I sought to interrupt the Senator a few moments ago. The State of Michigan highway authorities have specifically requested this precise aid because they are unable for the moment to proceed with the program involving three or four million dollars, which in contemplation of this legislation can be done. So far as our Commonwealth is concerned, this is a direct, specific, and, we think, immediate aid.

Mr. BLAINE. The States are going to spend it. They will have that much more to spend. But I wish to call the Senator's attention again to the fact that the State of Michigan will have to repay all of that money within the next five years and take it out of the funds allotted to that State under the Federal statute.

Mr. VANDENBERG. When the Senator says we must repay it, he means we must suffer deductions from future Federal appropriations?

Mr. BLAINE. Yes; until there is effected a repayment of the sum.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. BLAINE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BROOKHART. I would like to ask the Senator just how this coercion proposition is figured out when the States, or all of them, as he said, are contributing a good deal more than their half without aid from the Government at all, without aid to that excess.

Mr. BLAINE. My attention was diverted. Will the Senator kindly state his question again?

Mr. BROOKHART. I can not understand how, under the present situation, voting aid to a State is a coercion of the State in any way when the States of their own accord are not only matching the Federal appropriation but a good deal more than matching it with their appropriations from their own treasuries.

Mr. BLAINE. The Senator evidently misunderstood me. I said the proposed bill was in the nature of a coercive

measure. I did not say the general law was such a measure, but this bill coerces the States to expend money presumably for the relief of unemployment. The Federal Government says in effect, "We will let you have this money, but you will have to pay it back in five years." What I was complaining about was that the question of unemployment is a national question and the Federal Government ought directly and out of the public funds to come to the relief of the unemployed in the present situation. Here is where the Federal Government proposes to get away from that responsibility and force the responsibility upon the respective States; coerce them into that responsibility, and then those in charge of the administration of the Federal Government may make great claims of what the administration did under President Hoover for the relief of unemployment, when, as a matter of fact, so far as this \$80,000,000 is concerned, the entire relief will be afforded by the respective States and not by the Federal Government at all.

Mr. BROOKHART. May I ask the Senator another question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield further to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. BLAINE. I do.

Mr. BROOKHART. That sum is to be paid back in five years by credit on the Federal aid rendered to the States. The only difference is that it is an advance in time. It is still a credit under the general law. Is not that true?

Mr. BLAINE. Oh, no. Let me suggest this to the Senator from Iowa: I have had some experience with respect to the administration of the Federal-aid law and the administration of highway construction. A State, if it is foresighted and prudent, will have laid out a program of highway construction, not from year to year, not by piecemeal, but over a period, depending upon the time the legislature is to meet, of five or six years, perhaps in some States for a longer period, but so far as my own State is concerned, for a period of six years. That program as it affects my own State, while it is not a program set down by law, is the result of certain appropriations and certain provisions of the statute. The program was outlined in 1926 for a period of six years. That program is very definite and specific. Now, if my own State, for instance, has a program for six years from 1932 to 1938, the Senator will very clearly understand that by the deduction of these funds during a 5-year period, it will very surely interfere with the well-ordered program of my State and the respective States which have been prudent and which have outlined a program for any considerable period of time.

In other words, it will bring on a disorganization of that program; it will have the effect of bringing about greater unemployment than if the present emergency shall continue. It will merely mean an accumulation of troubles and difficulties. I am opposed to that, for the reason, as I have said, if the Federal Government is going to render aid in this national crisis that aid ought to be rendered by appropriations out of the Federal Treasury without any requirement on the part of the States to repay or return to the Federal Treasury the funds so appropriated.

Of course, if the Federal Government, as the President evidently seems to be of the opinion, has no responsibility in this crisis except to appropriate something like \$30,000,000 under this bill out of the Treasury of the United States, then that is the method we should pursue; but the bill clearly demonstrates the character of this administration with respect to the public welfare. It demonstrates, without the peradventure of a doubt, that this administration has no intention to permit any appreciable sum of money to be taken out of the Federal Treasury. Why? For the very reason that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] on yesterday stated. The administration is not willing to confront the grave responsibility of levying additional income and inheritance taxes upon those who are best and most able to pay, and who should contribute to the Nation's welfare during this crisis of unemployment.

This is not going to be a short crisis. We heard the President predict that it would be over in 60 days, and it

was not over in six months; and again the same statement came from the White House, without the least evidence that we are even in sight of the beginning of the termination of the present economic depression that has brought on so much misery to the workingman, and likewise so much misery to the men and women upon the farms.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield further to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. BLAINE. Yes.

Mr. BROOKHART. I think I agree with most of what the Senator from Wisconsin is saying, but the machinery for expending this money is set up by the States and is ready to operate. Direct appropriations out of the Treasury would be delayed somewhat before effective operations could start, whereas the State machinery for building roads is already in operation.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, I am in favor of the \$80,000,000 being appropriated as an additional sum for Federal highway construction to be expended through the agencies that are already set up, but I think it is a mere bagatelle. I have not heard anyone state to how many people employment would be furnished.

Mr. BROOKHART. Not enough; that is certain.

Mr. BLAINE. The number would be very small, I presume. My own State would receive about \$2,200,000. I know just about how many men will be employed under a highway program of \$2,200,000, and I think I could state it very accurately. I know it would be certainly a handful of men in comparison with the number who are out of employment.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. BLAINE. Yes.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I construe the effect of the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin to be that the States would, as provided by the present act, be required to supply funds equal to those allotted to them under this proposed act?

Mr. BLAINE. Exactly.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Yes; but the purpose of the Senator—

Mr. BLAINE. I think it is a very legitimate purpose, but it is quite immaterial, because the States have more than enough money in their treasuries to meet this added appropriation.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I do not know how that may be generally, but I am obliged to say to the Senator that the State of Montana has not; it will be utterly impossible for it to avail itself of the provisions of this proposed act unless some other language shall be substituted for that which the Senator proposes shall be stricken out.

Mr. BLAINE. I have not examined the schedule offered by the Senator from Iowa, but, as I recall, every State would have more money. I do not mean presently.

Let me explain to the Senator that the highway funds that come into the State treasury come in beginning with the very 1st of December. Those funds, to a very large extent, come from automobile-license money. There is not any question in my mind but that the citizens of Montana will have the funds obtained from automobile licenses within the next 30 or 90 days, and those funds will be available to match the Federal highway funds. The Senator's State also has the proceeds of the gasoline tax, which comes in regularly every month. Those funds may be used to match Federal highway funds.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Those funds are already pledged to match appropriations which have been made under the general act; we have arranged our tax system so that it is expected to meet the allotments that come to us from the general act. Both the automobile-license moneys and the gasoline tax are practically now all pledged. We impose upon ourselves a tax of 5 cents a gallon on gasoline in order to meet the allotment that is made to us under the

general appropriation. We shall not be able to avail ourselves of a dollar of this appropriation if the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin shall prevail and there shall be no other provision. As I understood the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] to say, the situation is quite the same in his State; that the State of Arkansas will be unable to avail itself of the advantages of this act under such an arrangement as that now proposed.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, that is a mere matter of detail. I say that there are or will be ample funds in the respective States to meet this additional highway appropriation.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I speak from information given me by the present chairman of the State Highway Commission of the State of Montana.

Mr. BLAINE. But the Senator is speaking of the highway funds allotted. I am speaking of highway funds that are to be received. I understand that within my State the general statutes set up the general scheme of how these funds are to be allotted, but in the allotment of those funds, I am sure, the Senator's State provides substantially, as no doubt the other States do, that certain of those funds may be spent upon the State trunk highway system in which is included the Federal-aid system. Each State expends many times more money upon the Federal-aid system—I mean upon the mileage, upon the same miles of highway—than it receives from the Federal Government.

It may be essential for the legislature to make a readjustment of the allotment, but that does not change the status of the funds that can be used to meet this proposed additional Federal aid. It merely means a change in the allotment. Instead of putting it upon some additional miles of the Federal highway system as such, the allotment is made to match this which goes upon the same miles; there is no difference excepting with respect to the mere allotment of the money.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Let me, then, inquire of the Senator whether this is not the situation, namely, that under his amendment, instead of the State providing for offsetting this during a period of five years commencing in 1933, the offsetting must be made immediately by the State? Is not that the effect of the amendment?

Mr. BLAINE. Will the Senator restate his question?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The bill provides that the State is required during a period of five years, commencing in 1932, to offset by funds of its own funds now advanced by this proposed act. The effect of the Senator's amendment will be, instead of thus offsetting the amount advanced by the Federal Government over a period of five years commencing in 1933, that the whole amount will have to be immediately set off in the year 1931.

Mr. BLAINE. Oh, no; my understanding is that this is an appropriation providing for—

Mr. WALSH of Montana. If the Senator will pardon me, I thought he was arguing when he introduced the subject in the first place that this ought not to be offset by the States at all; that there ought to be an appropriation of this amount out of the Federal Treasury without any obligation.

Mr. BLAINE. I am convinced that that ought to be the provision.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Very well; if that is the case, then, Mr. President, the Senator ought to provide a substitute in substance as follows:

Provided, That the States, respectively, shall not be required to provide any more for the purpose contemplated by the said act as a condition of the receipt of any funds hereby appropriated.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, if the Senator will offer that proviso as an amendment, I will accept it.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. If the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin shall prevail, I shall be forced to offer an amendment of this character.

Mr. BLAINE. I will be very glad, if the Senator will permit me, to offer the amendment he has suggested, and do so, with the Senator's consent. So, Mr. President, in lieu of the provision with respect to reimbursement, I offer as an

amendment the language suggested by the Senator from Montana.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Wisconsin or the Senator from Montana send the amendment to the desk, so that the clerk may keep the Record straight?

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. BLAINE. I do.

Mr. WAGNER. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Montana as to whether under his amendment the allocations would be the same as under the present Federal aid act?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Exactly.

Mr. WAGNER. Except that the States would not be required to match them?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Yes.

Mr. WAGNER. Of course that changes entirely the purpose of this whole proposal.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Exactly.

Mr. WAGNER. It was designed, as I understand, merely to accelerate the work which ordinarily would be done as a result of Federal aid. Instead of the work being done, say, a year from now or two years from now, this permits the acceleration of that work so as to move it up to a time nearer the period of economic depression in order, if we can, to alleviate it in some degree. I have grave doubts about its efficacy even as to that, but, as I understand, the only purpose of the amendment is to accelerate the construction of roads. The proposed amendment suggested by the Senator from Montana is a brand new proposal from the standpoint of the Federal Government's policy in making allocations to each particular State to aid in the construction of roads without any corresponding sum being contributed by the State governments.

Mr. BLAINE. Exactly; and the present unemployment situation presents a national problem, and the appropriations ought to be made out of the National Treasury with respect to those projects as to which the Federal Government proposes to contribute money.

Mr. WAGNER. Have we not this difficulty, then, if I may suggest it to the Senator from Wisconsin, that the Federal Government makes the appropriation for the construction of the road but has no say as to where, that is, upon what particular road within the State, the appropriation is to be spent.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. By no means, if the Senator will pardon me. It has exactly the same control over it that it has over the general appropriations—exactly the same control.

Mr. WAGNER. As I understand, this appropriation is being made under the Federal-aid highway system.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Yes.

Mr. WAGNER. That act prescribes the method of allocating funds and also requires for filing by the State with the Federal Government plans for the particular highways upon which the money is to be expended.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. This will go on in just exactly the same way. The only change is that the State does not match the amount.

Mr. WAGNER. The State does not make any contribution at all?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Exactly.

Mr. WAGNER. It is a new Federal policy, a new venture.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Undoubtedly, if we are to speak of it as a policy. This, of course, is only an emergency act which is supposed to take care of this particular emergency.

Mr. WAGNER. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas obtained the floor.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. HARRISON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Fletcher	La Follette	Simmons
Bingham	Frazier	McGill	Smith
Black	George	McKellar	Smoot
Blaine	Gillett	McMaster	Stelwer
Blease	Glass	McNary	Stephens
Borah	Glenn	Metcalf	Swanson
Bratton	Goff	Morrow	Thomas, Idaho
Brock	Goldsborough	Moses	Thomas, Okla.
Brookhart	Greene	Norbeck	Townsend
Broussard	Hale	Norris	Trammell
Bulkley	Harris	Nye	Tydings
Capper	Harrison	Oddie	Vandenberg
Caraway	Hatfield	Patterson	Wagner
Carey	Hawes	Phipps	Walcott
Connally	Hayden	Pittman	Walsh, Mass.
Copeland	Heflin	Ransdell	Walsh, Mont.
Couzens	Howell	Reed	Waterman
Cutting	Johnson	Robinson, Ark.	Watson
Dale	Jones	Robinson, Ind.	Wheeler
Davis	Kean	Schall	Williamson
Deneen	Kendrick	Sheppard	
Dill	Keyes	Shipstead	
Fess	King	Shortridge	

Mr. TOWNSEND. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. HASTINGS] is unavoidably absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

STATEMENT ON RELIEF LEGISLATION

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, this seems an appropriate time to make clear some matters that apparently have become clouded by misrepresentation or confusion.

That the United States is experiencing an economic crisis which presents more serious difficulties than any heretofore known is probably admitted by all who are familiar with conditions. It is no part of my purpose now to attempt a discussion of the causes or the factors that have resulted in the most distressing situation the oldest Senator has ever known.

It may be assumed that everyone is desirous of being just and fair, and of demonstrating those sympathies and feelings that are reflected by peoples of culture, not only in our own land but in other parts of the world, as well as by the humblest who is often called to meet perils and distress.

To my mind, it is unfortunate that the discussion of a question about which all should agree in purpose should become, for whatever cause, the occasion of expressions which are calculated to divert us from the performance of a duty which, after all, is the obligation which rests upon us, and which can not be treated with indifference or neglect.

It is my solemn judgment, matured after a somewhat careful study of press publicity and statements made or attributed to persons who are interested in pursuing the course which is best calculated to accomplish the results we all desire, that some have not disclosed that knowledge of the conditions that prevail, and to which our efforts for remedy are directed, that should be acquired before dealing with subjects of such great importance.

We all know that unemployment has prevailed for a prolonged period and that conditions do not now indicate the speedy disappearance of that source of distress. To me there can be no more pathetic spectacle in all the range of human vision than that of a sincere and loyal citizen, upon whom wife and children depend, willing to exert his efforts and to exhaust his energies in earning a livelihood for them—a citizen who finds himself, through no fault or failure of his own, unable to obtain the opportunity to earn a living.

However we may differ as to the measures which ought to be advanced, however we may grow petulant and assert the right of independent decision as to what should best be done when that conclusion should be reached by the concentration of the energies of us all, we can not banish from our vision the picture of millions of men who are not able to secure employment with the Government, who can not stand behind the shield of the civil service, who may never hope to establish their eligibility for the performance of those duties for which, under the customs prevailing in modern times, men earn large salaries or great wages.

No language can depict the sorrow, the desolation, the despair, which cast their gloom across the way of the brave but discouraged man who can not do what necessity impels him to attempt, what tender sympathy and refined affection drive him to essay.

So let me assume that in the minds of all of us there is a common purpose, and that that purpose is to perform our duty and meet our obligations in the face of the criticism of those who are either ignorant of the true situation, or who, for some cause, may not be inspired with that appreciation for the necessities of decisive action which ought to move them.

When the Congress convened there existed the general recognition of necessity for emergency legislation, and everyone knew that proposals would be advanced, but no plans had been formulated, no measures had been drafted, or, if plans had been formulated or measures drafted, those plans and measures had not been submitted, for lack of opportunity, to those whose duty requires them to deal with this important subject.

The President, earlier in the season and during the vacation of Congress, organized committees in various States, and the organizations were extended to the smallest political units. The primary purpose of the organizations was to make a survey and obtain the information necessary to enable the Congress to deal with the emergency.

When the Congress met, numerous measures were introduced, both in the Senate and in the House. A common purpose runs through all those measures. There existed great diversity of opinion as to the best remedy, and the fact that such diversity appeared is not surprising to one familiar with legislative processes.

The President's committee assembled their data, collaborated, and reached conclusions which are expressed in resolutions which appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. They found, among other things, that approximately \$60,000,000 would be required for advances or loans to farmers within the drought-stricken areas, and, so far as I am informed, none of those committees has indicated a disposition to recede from the conclusions to which I have referred.

The Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry gave consideration to the various measures and acted promptly. In the performance of a duty I appeared before that committee. It had become known that the Budget had recommended a reduction of the \$60,000,000 proposed fund to \$25,000,000. There had been no statement published, no figures had been prepared disclosing a sound financial or economic basis for the recommendation of the Budget. In my judgment, after giving such thought to that phase of the question as I am capable of, the Budget merely desired to pursue an economical course, to conserve the funds in the Treasury, and arbitrarily decided that \$25,000,000 was necessary. I am speaking now particularly to the President and to those representatives of the press, as well as my associates, who have, I believe in ill temper and without fair consideration, denounced such measures as raids upon the Treasury of the United States.

Mark me, there is not the slightest sensitiveness on my own part to criticism. A long service in public life has trained me to the fact that public men may expect criticism, and that they have no ground of complaint if it is just. If this be a raid on the Treasury of the United States it is right to characterize it as such, and I am entirely content to accept the odium which attaches to such a transaction on the part of a public officer. But I have assumed this afternoon impliedly the obligation of proving that the measure was not only proper but necessary, and I wish to paint another picture and lift it into light alongside the picture of unemployment which I tried to present a few moments ago.

Probably the area which would be comprised within 12 States, for the most part contiguous to one another, has the extraordinary situation of a great drought superimposed on the general depression with which we are all familiar, so that added to the unemployment which has resulted from displacement of laborers in industry, for whatever cause in

that vast area, there has occurred during the year now approaching its end such a crop failure, due to drought, as has never before been witnessed.

In order that those of you who have no sympathy or who have failed to manifest sympathy with the people in the drought-stricken regions who are in such great distress may have, if possible, some comprehension of the difficulty and distress, let me attempt an explanation in brief of how farmers habitually finance their operations within that territory.

Those who have not the cash to carry on must make arrangements with their banks or merchants to advance funds with which to make a crop. Usually such personal property as they possess, including prospective or growing crops, is pledged as security for the advancement. Did Senators ever think what a gamble is the game of farming? The farmer gambles on the elements and on the weather in planting time. Then if the seeds come up he gambles against the chance that some bug will come along and destroy the plant. If ravages by pests do not bring disaster, he then faces the season of growth and cultivation. If a drought occurs, failure of production results, notwithstanding that at the time of the drought practically all of the advances have been exhausted in efforts to grow the crop. If a complete or almost complete crop failure is experienced, the producer finds himself with his property gone, his labor wasted, his credit exhausted, and with no means with which he can carry on.

But the condition which I am trying to describe is accentuated and abnormal from two causes and their effect. First is the general depression which has reflected itself in part in the depression of prices to such a point that even large crops would scarcely yield more than the cost of production. The price of cotton within about two years has declined one-half. A similar fall in prices has taken place with respect to other commodities. Second, during 1930, from the 1st of May until approaching the 1st of October, there came no rainfall in a belt which comprises some 10 or 12 States and which embraces very fertile lands. As the result of that lack of rainfall, except as to certain small areas where because of the peculiar character of the soil there was fair production, an almost complete crop failure resulted, and it extended to hay, corn, and cotton.

To give a somewhat concrete illustration, I traveled through a county in the State of Arkansas through which winds one of the swiftest and most beautiful streams in all the world, the Little Red River. Its comparatively small bottom is composed of the most fertile land in all that section. In the summer of 1930, when the cotton and corn should have been maturing, I had the opportunity to drive through Little Red River bottom, and the result of my investigation showed that 50 acres in that territory would not produce one wagonload of corn and 30 acres would not produce one bale of cotton. In the little homes scattered over those fields and at the ends of the lanes lived men and women who had worked all the year in efforts to grow crops. They do not belong to the union. Every Senator who hears me who is familiar with conditions in that country knows that at early dawn they enter the fields and they return home in the twilight, having worked all day long. I think every man with a heart in his breast and with a brain in his head ought to feel some measure of sympathy, and reflect it in his course, for those who do their duty to themselves and their country, and who yet, because of forces which they can not control, are placed in an appalling situation of distress.

The conclusion, therefore, is that if one is to deal with the subject at all he must deal with it adequately. I do not know that one can go to the length the President went in his message to the Congress at the beginning of this session when he said:

We have as a nation a definite duty to see that no deserving person in our country suffers from hunger or cold.

I think when the President made that statement as outlining his conception of the duty upon the Congress and upon himself that he defined an impossible task. In spite

of all we may do here, in spite of all the roads we may build, in spite of all the Red Cross flags we may lift into light, in spite of all the hands we may employ in carrying food to those who are hungry, in spite of the most liberal action we may take, there will still be people in our land who will suffer from hunger and cold. But if Senators agree with me that it is our duty to deal with this problem liberally, while having a proper regard for the general revenues, to place above the consideration of possible embarrassment to the Treasury the duty of providing adequate funds to relieve distress, they can not characterize the McNary resolution, carrying \$60,000,000, which we passed yesterday, as a "raid on the Treasury."

The only way to prevent people from suffering from hunger is to provide them with the means of obtaining their own food or the opportunity to do so, or to provide them with the food. Those who are in a fortunate situation, who have merely experienced losses in the decline of stocks, but who may yet still have sufficient resources to provide for themselves and their families the comforts and necessities of life, ought to be slow to stand in the way of any policy or movement which will give adequate relief. In spite of the best spirit that we can show, there will be disagreement and discord as to what ought to be done. We may not be able to cooperate, but we ought to do it if we can.

Before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry it was my privilege to say that the issue was coming inevitably between an effort to reduce the appropriation to \$25,000,000 and to maintain it at the amount which those had investigated the subject in a scientific way had found was necessary. If Senators desire to be fair, and to do justice, let them study the facts and reach their conclusions upon the facts. It will be found that instead of \$60,000,000 being excessive, if it is properly and sympathetically administered, it is more than likely to prove inadequate.

I thought that additional measures relating to unemployment and distress should receive consideration and proposed in Senate bill 4786 to provide, in addition to the \$60,000,000 which was carried in the joint resolution of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], a \$5,000,000 fund to be advanced to each State upon such terms and conditions as the President and the governor of the State concerned might agree upon, to be used in the construction of what are known as farm-market roads in contradistinction to Federal-aid highways. That proposition had been endorsed by numerous organizations throughout the country. The thought underlying it was that during the season when those who live in farm communities are not engaged in growing crops they might be employed in doing work of permanent benefit to the country and to the States in the way of constructing necessary highways; and the thought has met with much approval. However, this provision is essentially supplemental to and not in lieu of the \$60,000,000 appropriation.

There is also a provision in the bill to which I have referred authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to carry on agricultural extension work in those districts where local units are unable to make the contribution contemplated by law. I think that proposal would be helpful. The extension service is valuable, and a discontinuance of it will result in a backward movement as a consequence of which much of the benefit that has heretofore been obtained will be lost or minimized.

There is also a provision contemplating the distribution of the wheat acquired by the Federal Farm Board, and that provision must, if it shall be considered, be enlarged so as not to restrict it to those living within the drought areas.

When I drew that bill I knew that the question of a possible deficit in the Treasury would arise. I was willing to anticipate such a situation, and I incorporated section 5 authorizing, if the President found it necessary, the issuance by the Treasury of notes or bonds to cover the amount required in this emergency. I am perfectly willing, in order that the proper measures may be enacted and administered, to pass on to a better day, hoped for, the unusual and ex-

traordinary costs which would be incurred under such legislation as that which the Senate is considering to-day; I would prefer to do that to seeing an increase in Federal taxes under present conditions; but I would increase taxes rather than refuse to meet the obligation, which is primary upon the Congress, to provide relief for our own people in a time of emergency and danger.

It was not characterized as "a raid on the Treasury" when we appropriated \$20,000,000 to feed Russian women and children. No one characterized it as "a raid on the Treasury" when we appropriated \$100,000,000 to feed the hungry in Europe except those living within the territory of our recent enemies. We thought those were acts of justice and of kindness. If the obligation was upon us to provide relief in those cases, what shall I say, and what will you say, Mr. President, when a crisis of the worst character describable confronts our own people? You may talk about precedents all you will, but there are some things that are necessary to be done in order to preserve the lives of the people; and when those things are being discussed or acted upon it is not an opportune occasion to raise technical objections.

In the recent past there has been some discussion of a statement signed by certain Democrats, a statement in which I joined. An effort has been made to make it appear that that statement was prompted either from political motives solely or from a disregard of the obligations of party loyalty. The President apparently lost his temper when he issued the statement of yesterday immediately following the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 211, authorizing the appropriation of \$60,000,000 for drought relief. Coming at the time it was made, the declaration that "prosperity can not be restored by raids upon the Public Treasury," and that the leaders of both political parties are cooperating to prevent that result, prompts me to a review of some facts which I think are pertinent in this discussion, facts which should be given attention by all fair-minded persons.

Believing that a serious crisis confronted this country, and recalling that in the critical days following the World War partisan influences were exerted in the Congress to embarrass President Wilson and to produce discord when harmonious action was required to safeguard the public interest, I with other Democrats joined in the statement asserting a purpose to be helpful in relieving a situation recognized as highly critical. When that statement had been published the President wired me his thanks, but declared that it needed clarification with respect to one feature, namely, would there be a filibuster against the passage of appropriation bills with a view to compelling an extra session of Congress? I replied that, speaking for myself, I had never engaged in filibusters against appropriation bills and had no expectation of doing so, but that there was certain legislation the passage of which it was my intention to secure if possible. The legislation enumerated included emergency relief measures.

I thought that correspondence should have been published, in view of the fact that its occurrence was taken as an occasion on the part of some to indicate that I had made myself a mere tool of the White House and had pledged the President support of his political policies.

It was my judgment that the country needed cooperation on the part of politicians whether Democrats, Republicans, or Progressives, in the working out and in the enactment of relief measures; and that judgment has been confirmed by the action of the President in his statement of yesterday and by the reaction to that statement which has taken place in the Senate of the United States.

The statement to which reference is made announces three principles. There is room for question whether the particular gentlemen who signed the statement had any responsibility to do so; there is room for question whether the statement was couched in appropriate language; but in my judgment there is no room to doubt the correctness of the principle underlying the declaration, and I stand on it.

I have referred to the three principles which, according to my interpretation, are incorporated in that statement:

First, nonpartisan cooperation in the Congress on every measure conducive to the welfare of the country.

Of course, that is a general statement, and inevitably questions will arise as to what measures are conducive to the general welfare, but the thought is that there are some measures which by their very nature are not of a partisan character, and those measures are well illustrated by the relief bills which have been presented to the Congress of the United States. The second proposition was—and I quote from the statement itself—

Cooperation in any sound legislation to remedy the evils that are afflicting the Nation.

The third was—

That obstructive methods will not be resorted to to embarrass the President or to defeat necessary appropriations; and that qualified appointees will not be rejected merely because the appointments are made by a President of the opposite party.

That substantially is the language of the statement to which I am referring.

I think if it were possible to carry on the work of this session of Congress in the spirit of that declaration, the country would be better off and our work would be more effectively done. The declaration or statement may be criticized as trite or unnecessary.

Who insists that it is the duty of a Senator, whether he is a Democrat or belongs to some other political party, to oppose a nomination because we may have the votes to reject it and because it is made by a President of the opposite party? There have been times when that situation has threatened; but, so far as I am concerned, I do not approve of the use of partisan influence to defeat legislation or to defeat nominations to office merely because it will give embarrassment to the leader of the opposition party or accomplish other results of a similar character.

How can anyone justify a contrary declaration? How can anyone insist that at a time when the Congress is equally divided in both branches, and the Presidency is in the control of the Republican Party, it is the duty of a patriotic Democrat to beat every nomination that he can, without regard to the qualifications of the nominee, and to defeat every measure the defeat of which will result in embarrassing the President? Of course, it is only by a process of interpretation different from that which I place upon the instrument that one can find ground for criticism.

The point I wish to emphasize is that we have proceeded to an unfortunate position. Oh, you may say, "We care nothing about that, and we care nothing about your opinion concerning it"; nevertheless, it is an important matter.

The President lost his temper and made a statement that, of course, is to be condemned. For my part, I do not propose to follow the bad example that has been set. My purpose is to try to do my duty to my party, to my people, and, most of all, to my country. I recognize that my standards of duty may be perverted or inferior and that they are subject to criticism; but I should like to see this Congress now act in a spirit of greater cooperation—and by "cooperation" I do not mean that one man shall walk away and another follow. I mean that if they are separated by a distance they shall advance to a common point and get together and work together. That is cooperation. I cooperate, and intend to continue to cooperate, in the enactment of measures which I believe will promote the welfare of the country. I intend to cooperate in the confirmation of nominees whom I believe to be fitted for office. That does not mean, and no sane man can construe it to mean, cooperation in the passage of unjust or unwholesome measures or in the confirmation of unfitted nominees to office.

Congress has a great task before it. The Nation is facing a crisis. Our responsibility is the greatest we have ever encountered. Bearing it in the spirit of true patriots, we shall not find it necessary to abandon the policies or the principles which we believe should prevail in the administration of this great Government.

I thank the Senate for its patient attention.

TAXES PAID BY NEW YORK STOCK EXCHANGE AND MEMBERS THEREOF

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I send to the desk two Senate resolutions. I ask that they may be read, and then I shall ask unanimous consent for their present consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The first resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 366) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby requested to transmit to the Senate the information showing the amount of taxes paid to the Government by the New York Stock Exchange or by members thereof in connection with exchange transactions for the years 1919, 1920, and each succeeding year up to and including the year 1930.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alabama asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution. Is there objection?

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that the resolution may go over for a day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will go over under objection.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Utah to withdraw his objection and let the resolution pass at this time. Fees are paid by the exchange. The Government collects from the exchanges every year. I want to ascertain how much was paid into this fund in taxes for 1919, 1920, and up to and including this year.

Mr. SMOOT. I did not catch all of the resolution, but I should like to have it go over and I shall look into it to-night.

Mr. HEFLIN. Very well; I shall bring it up to-morrow, Mr. President.

AMOUNT OF MONEY IN CIRCULATION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alabama submits a second resolution, which will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 367) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby requested to give to the Senate the information showing the amount of money in circulation in the United States for the years 1919, 1920, and for each succeeding year up to and including the year 1930.

Mr. HEFLIN. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution. It will take only a moment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alabama asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution. Is there objection?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, my attention was distracted. I did not hear the full reading of the resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be again read.

The Chief Clerk reread the resolution.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I do not see any necessity for the resolution, because statements showing the amount of money in circulation are published every three months; the amounts are shown in the annual reports of the Secretary of the Treasury, and the information can be compiled in 15 minutes by a clerk in the Finance Committee.

Mr. HEFLIN. It will take only a little while to get the statement from the Secretary of the Treasury; and I am sure he will be glad to give it.

Mr. REED. I do not think it is very important where we get it. I am only suggesting to the Senator that he can secure the information in less time than he can get the resolution up to the Treasury Department.

Mr. HEFLIN. I do not think so.

Mr. REED. I know it. However, I do not object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution? The Chair hears none.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADDRESS BY E. KANN ON THE SILVER CRISIS

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I have in my possession an address by Mr. E. Kann, delivered at the Pan Pacific Con-

ference in Shanghai, China. It is a very brief and able address on the financial conditions affecting the world to-day. As the speaker is a distinguished writer on economics and finance and the address deals with matters which the Foreign Relations Committee is now considering, I ask leave that the address may be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The address is as follows:

In accepting your kind invitation to speak on present-day aspects of silver I have certainly undertaken a most arduous task, for the subject itself is, under prevailing conditions, a most somber topic. That it is very dry besides and that it can not be divorced from the citation of figures makes my task doubly difficult, for figures do not lend themselves readily to rhetorical feats. On the contrary, they are liable to throttle all pathos.

While I find it impossible to omit quoting figures—for these are my witnesses in the conduct of a most difficult case—I shall avoid unnecessary statistics and confine my statements to the citation of round figures, minus decimals and fractions.

As a necessary preliminary to our study it is essential to refresh our memories as to the quantity of silver produced and as to the sources of origin. In considering the world's output of silver during the last decade, 1921-1930, we obtain an annual world production of 240,000,000 ounces, or 20,000,000 ounces a month. To many people these figures may not convey an exact measurement of what is happening. Therefore I should like to express myself more popularly: During the past 10 years the world has been producing new silver to the extent of 1,000,000 Chinese dollars a day. Although irrelevant to our topic, I might mention here, for the sake of comparison only, that simultaneously the world's production of gold during the last decade was only $8\frac{1}{2}$ per cent of the silver output as far as weight is concerned, but four times as much—at present exchange levels—as regards value. (United States, \$1,050,000 per diem.)

Retaining the last decade as unit of measurement, we arrive at the following distribution as regards output of silver:

	Annual production of fine ounces
Mexico, 40 per cent.....	96,000,000
United States, 24 per cent.....	58,000,000
Canada, 9 per cent.....	22,000,000
All North America, 73 per cent.....	176,000,000
South America, 11 per cent.....	26,000,000
Central America, 1 per cent.....	2,000,000
The Americas, 85 per cent.....	204,000,000
Asia, 5 per cent.....	12,000,000
Africa, 1 per cent.....	2,000,000
Europe, 9 per cent.....	22,000,000
Total world, 100 per cent.....	240,000,000

We possess reliable statistics as regards the production of silver since the discovery of America, i. e., since 1493. The total quantity of silver produced between that year and 1930—which means in the course of the past 438 years—aggregates in round figures 15,000,000,000 ounces. This stupendous quantity, meaning 15,000,000,000 fine ounces of silver, may have much significance to you—or else it is possible that the naked figure may remain meaningless without further elucidation.

Upon analyzing this figure it becomes obvious that it contains highly significant facts. Out of those 15,000,000,000 ounces of silver produced 9,000,000,000 have been obtained during the first 408 years, 1493-1900, and 6,000,000,000 have been obtained during the last 30 years, 1901-1930. This, in turn, means that, whereas the total world production of silver during the first 408 years averaged 22,000,000 ounces a year, the average world output, during the past 30 years, had risen to 200,000,000 fine ounces per annum.

Speaking generally, this undisputable fact has not been made clear to the public. Nevertheless the people have a feeling that there has been overproduction of silver and that, in consequence thereof, a severe crisis has broken out. However, I personally am convinced that the present crisis is not due to overproduction, that the latter is merely imaginary, and that the serious slump is due to other causes which I shall endeavor to treat in detail.

WORLD'S PROGRESS

At this stage I should merely like briefly to point to the enormous increase of the world's population, to the growth of civilization, to the creation of means of communications, the establishment of banking facilities and regulated government finance, all of which have made the demand for more silver imperative. If we go back to the Middle Ages we shall find that the use of any and all commodities was then very much restricted, not merely because of the absence of the aforementioned factors, but because these remote periods were coupled with a much lower standard of living. The output of copper, lead, iron, cotton, etc.,

was then infinitely smaller than to-day. There is nothing remarkable or suspicious in the steady growth of silver production.¹

But aside from bare necessities let us consider some articles which may be viewed as semiluxuries. Take natural silk and artificial silk, the latter unknown to the world before the dawn of the current century, while the former was hardly known in the Old World when the New World was being discovered. The opinion has gained ground amongst a vast circle of society that, since rayon silk has been making such enormous strides, the use of raw silk is bound to be radically curtailed. Yet nothing is further from the truth.

In 1913 the world's output of artificial silk yarn was 36,000,000 pounds; in 1929 it had risen to 400,000,000 pounds, an increase of about 1,100 per cent in 16 years.

The consumption of raw silk in 1914 was 50,000,000 pounds; in 1929 it had risen to 150,000,000 pounds, an increase of 200 per cent in 15 years. This augmentation has taken place parallel with the stupendous increase of natural silk's rival—artificial silk. But both have found uses, due to the continually increasing standard of living.

It may be asked where the huge stock of 15,000,000,000 ounces of silver is being stored. After closely investigating I can prove the existence of 4,500,000,000 ounces in British India, 2,500,000,000 ounces in China, and about 1,000,000,000 ounces in the coinage systems of the rest of the world. How much silver has been employed in the arts during the past centuries, how much has been buried in the earth, how much has been lost in the deep sea or irrecoverably devoted to silver plating and film manufacture is not easy to ascertain.

I have deemed it essential to offer you these sober truths as a preliminary to my main topic, the real causes of the current silver crisis. Before attending to those grim realities I should like you to kindly follow me into the realm of the infinitely distant prehistoric ages. Landing in one of the romantic bays of the Aegean Sea we wind our way inland through fragrant groves of blossoming olive trees. After many hours' walk we reach a lovely valley surrounded by emerald green terraces of most fascinating meadows. Here, under the protection of patriarchal trees, we shall await the coming morn.

The midnight calm is suddenly interrupted by sounds emanating from gongs beaten at lengthy intervals. Occasionally the wind carries faint traces of singing voices to our ears—traces of songs of lamentation. A funeral procession is moving through the darkness of a somber night.

Now the new moon is casting dim rays of light through the clouds hurrying along their heavenly path. Your eagerly searching eyes begin to behold the vague outlines of slowly moving figures, an enormous army marching tardily onward, winding its way uphill and appearing from the distance like a huge chain, on the clattering links of which grim history of thousands of years is running along.

The last remains of a king and his royal consort are being carried to their eternal resting place, situated in specially prepared stone vaults in the heart of a mighty mountain group.

RATIO OF GOLD AND SILVER

Five thousand eventful years have passed since that night. As a result of excavations undertaken only five years ago near the Greek village of Dendra, the vaulted graves of a once mighty king and his royal spouse have been discovered. Lying at the breast of the skeletons were seen golden cups, and at their feet were deposited vases of heavy gold. These golden ornaments were covered at the surface with a thin layer of silver; some were inlaid with silver thread.

The discovery of those prehistoric ornaments has furnished undeniable proofs of assertions found in writings dated shortly

¹If additional evidence was required in connection with the assertion that silver production has expanded to a lesser extent, during the past 130 years, than the other metals with which it is found associated in the ore, I like to refer to a table prepared by C. W. Merrill, of the U. S. Department of Commerce (Summarized Data of Silver Production, Washington, 1930), going to 1920. The figures for the last decade have been estimated by myself, and also the end result worked out.

Rate of increase of world production of silver, lead, copper, gold, and zinc:

Increase over preceding decade, per cent

Decade	Silver	Lead	Copper	Gold	Zinc
1801-1820.....	-39.5	39.4	36.6	-34.8	142.6
1821-1830.....	-11.4	108.2	45.1	22.8	595.1
1831-1840.....	28.5	25.2	33.3	40.2	53.5
1841-1850.....	28.4	16.3	35.5	160.2	143.4
1851-1860.....	18.6	38.8	53.7	277.2	112.8
1861-1870.....	33.3	46.1	51.4	-5.4	66.2
1871-1880.....	77.3	39.8	23.9	-7.4	55.8
1881-1890.....	40.9	40.1	74.8	-7.4	65.3
1891-1900.....	62.1	50.5	66.7	94.0	39.7
1901-1910.....	12.8	37.5	83.8	80.9	57.6
1911-1920.....	7.0	11.6	59.8	12.3	30.8
1921-1930 (about.).....	12.0	70.0	65.0	-13.0	50.0
Average increase during 130 years.....	22.5	48.6	52.48	51.6	114.4

before the commencement of the Christian era, stating that thousands of years ago 1 unit of silver was valued at 10 units of gold.

Since then the position has radically been reversed, for to-day the ratio between gold and silver is 1 to 60. The change developed gradually. In the early Middle Ages the proportion was 1 unit of gold to 10 of silver. Until A. D. 1600 it was 1:11.3. Two hundred years later, in 1800, it had grown to 15. By 1900 it had further increased to 35.3, but during the World War, when the white metal experienced its last glory, the proportion had diminished to 22.5, while to-day it actually exceeds 60 units of silver to 1 of gold. In connection with this statement there is one highly interesting point to be recorded, namely, the proportion of the output of silver to that of gold. While the price ratio was almost invariably widening (against silver) that of production was frequently on the decrease. To illustrate plainly what has just been stated I would like to refer to the fact that, while the total world production of gold to-day (about 20,000,000 ounces) stands in the proportion to the output of silver (about 250,000,000 ounces a year) like 1:12½, the market prices show a ratio of 1:60.

THE COLLAPSE IN SILVER PRICES

With these basic facts before us, let us now consider the real causes of the collapse of silver prices. These are here being enumerated in the sequences and importance which I personally attach to their fate.

(1) The extra supply of huge stocks of silver derived from demonetized coin, a movement in which many countries have taken part. This incident had doubly harmful consequences: Firstly, because large extra quantities of silver were thrown on the market, irrespective of whether, when, and where these were wanted; secondly, the most derogatory moral effect caused not merely by this unprincipled action but also by the uncertainty, or rather the certainty, of more coming, perhaps, in the near future, or possibly at a later date. This has been a huge black cloud overshadowing the silver market like the angel of death.

The movement was initiated by Great Britain in 1920. At that time the British pound sterling had lost 20 to 25 per cent in value. The wounds caused by a most frightful war were still wide open. The finance minister had to hunt for means wherewith to balance the country's budget. It is reliably asserted that Mr. Winston Churchill, the then Chancellor of the Exchequer, in searching for funds wherewith to reduce his budgetary deficit, struck upon the idea of melting all of Great Britain's silver coinage (then 0.925 fine) and reminting the same, but with a basic fineness of only 0.500. This measure is supposed to have netted him £3,000,000. Large quantities of extra silver were then disposed of in 1921 and 1922, probably 90,000,000 ounces. But the sale of further supplies from the same source continued from year to year, unheralded and uncontrolled. In 1929 alone about 10,000,000 ounces were being supplied to an unwilling market.

The example of England was promptly followed by Germany and Poland, which countries both struck new silver coins with a fineness of only 0.500. Forced by the exigencies of the World War, Germany had been forced to liquidate almost all her silver stocks.

France did likewise. In 1919 and 1920 France became a large seller of silver, a considerable portion of which, derived from melted 5-franc pieces, was shipped to Shanghai. During her severe monetary troubles, extending until 1928, France abstained from minting silver coins, but instead circulated in the country 1 and 2 franc pieces made from brass and aluminium. At the present moment France is engaged in replacing her small bank-note coupures by silver coins of 10 and 20 francs face amount, but these will be only 0.680 fine, in place of the old silver content of 900. Meanwhile France has constantly been figuring as a seller of demonetized silver, thereby doing irreparable harm to the reputation of the white metal.

The example of these countries was promptly followed by most of their neighbors, notably Belgium, Switzerland, and Italy, all of which have figured as potential sellers of silver at most inopportune times. While it is thought that these volcanoes have lived their most temperamental life, one must not forget that underground fires have sometimes burst out anew when least expected.

During the latter part of 1929 Indo-China sold large quantities of silver, derived from demonetized piaster coins, in preparation of her adoption of the gold-bullion standard in the spring of the current year. The quantity disposed of may be estimated at 50,000,000 ounces. As the sale was carried out just when the silver slide had set in, a veritable avalanche developed, causing panic on the world's silver markets.

BRITISH INDIA

The greatest adversary to silver's stability, however, was and still is British India. At the close of 1926 it was definitely resolved to change from the then existing gold-exchange standard to an effective gold-bullion standard and to dispose of large quantities of silver, derived from demonetized rupee coin. The total amount for sale was not fixed by law and was made dependent upon the quantities of rupee coins reverting to the treasury from circulation. A preliminary estimate was suggestive of an approximate quantity of 240,000,000 ounces of bar silver (one year's world production) to be disposed of whenever the authorities thought fit. The total amount of melted silver sold up to now by the Indian treasury is about 85,000,000 ounces. This figure in itself is not large, yet the danger is to be seen in the undefined future policy as to time and quantity of further silver stocks being disposed of. Due to the fact that most of the other sources of sur-

plus silver will give out in the near future, there would be better prospects ahead for the white metal if it were not for the genuine threat emanating from India.

Time does not permit to present to you more than this very brief sketch on the question of extra supplies. However, I trust that the position in its deplorable simplicity has been made quite clear.

DECLINE IN WORLD COMMODITY VALUES

(2) The second cause for the heavy decline of silver is clearly to be seen in the general decline of all world commodities. While silver in China is first and foremost a medium of currency, it represents on the rest of the globe a commercial commodity. All raw material has fallen in price recently to an alarming degree, and silver has formed no exception.

It is a well-known fact that silver prices have invariably been marching parallel with commodity values. If graphic proof for this contention were needed, I should like to refer to a chart showing silver quotations, together with world commodity prices between 1914 and 1929, published in Finance and Commerce, No. 46, of April 16, 1930.

I might go a step farther by asserting from experience that almost invariably silver price movements have preceded the rise or fall of the value of world commodities. There is plausible explanation for this coincidence by pointing to India and China, whose population represents the largest holders and the largest consumers of silver. Whenever the farmer obtains good returns for his harvest, he will be able to buy silver in large quantities. On the other hand, whenever grain, cotton, and other agricultural produce is low priced, the country people can not afford to buy silver for savings.

Thus is there hope for the resuscitation of silver values as soon as there is a rise in the price level of world commodities in general, and agricultural products in particular.

WARFARE IN CHINA

(3) The third primary cause for the depression of silver values is to be seen in the long-lasting internal warfare in China, resulting not only in the interruption of means of transport but also in the impoverishment of the rural population and in the extinction of the latter's buying power. Metallic money can not be moved about, and while the seaports are overburdened with silver funds, the interior is bare of all supplies. The argument in support of my third contention is so obvious that it becomes superfluous to try to bring in further evidence.

I may possibly be required to prove that the regular world production of silver, say, 240,000,000 ounces on an average for the past decade, is not too heavy for the genuine needs of the world.

Such proofs are not difficult to produce. Taking the average of the past five years as present-day standard, we find that China and India consumed annually 85,000,000 ounces of bar silver each. This accounts for 170,000,000. The arts and industries employ 40,000,000 per annum, leaving 30,000,000 for distribution within the rest of the wide world, principally for coinage purposes which, in face of all pessimism, are still being carried on.

Add to these facts the hypothetical possibility that, as a result of a conference, India should agree to suspend sales of government silver for, say, three years on condition that other governmental treasuries agree to adhere to the identical embargo. In such an event you would see an immediate depreciation in the price of silver to an extent which one may estimate without undue optimism at about 30 per cent. The question of "overproduction" would then have disappeared altogether.

There is no possibility to-day to even touch upon the subject relative to the behavior of silver in the event of China being enabled to introduce a gold standard. The moral effect would once more destroy confidence in silver, but in practice the measure would surely be beneficial to the white metal, because China would need stupendous quantities of metallic money for circulation, and as gold would be unavailable, silver coins would have to be minted on a very large scale.

The purpose of what I have related to you hitherto is to throw light on the real causes of the disaster which has befallen silver lately and to destroy the myth that legitimate production of the white metal is much larger than consumption. If I have succeeded in expressing my views clearly and convincingly, I shall be satisfied. It is merely one phase of the important subject which I have tackled to-day.

THE POOR FISH

And now, before closing, I should like to relate to you a story, as it has been told to me by an acquaintance. When lying on the sandy beach of a northern seaside resort last summer I wondered why the beautiful bay stretching out before our eyes was so poor in catches of fish. And then my friend spoke: "Last year when swimming in this bay I suddenly felt a small fish in my left hand. I quickly brought it ashore and placed it in a small bucket filled with sea water. It proved to be a herring. The fish did well after arriving in Shanghai, but after some time the sea water gave out through evaporation. So I tried fresh water and the herring continued to thrive. Well, I thought, if it can live in fresh water, it might also exist without water."

"The experiment was successful. Soon my herring moved about in the room, and shortly thereafter it followed me through the streets to the bewilderment of passers-by. One day, when crossing Chapoo Road bridge with me the poor fish fell into the Soochow Creek and was drowned."

This story may sound somewhat incredible to some of you, and frivolous to others. But on second thought you might find that in real life it has some foundation in fact.

Once upon a time the Chancellor of the Exchequer of a mighty kingdom had great worries with regard to the balancing of his budget. A red herring was chasing through the multitude of his figures. And he caught the fish. The rest of the simile becomes clear. He argued: "After having been accustomed for decades to the handling of coins made of the finest sterling silver, the public now accepts without murmur a cheap substitute looking like pewter."

And a neighboring Republic went a step farther, arguing: "If the public is satisfied with silver 500 fine, it might accept aluminum and brass alloyed coins." And the argument worked.

Far across the sea the most northern portion of a huge eastern Republic, the richest domain of the country, heard of the story and argued: "If people agree to accept money from base metal, they might be taught to accept paper without metallic cover." The argument was put into effect, and it actually succeeded. But the poor fish was drowned.

Manchuria, a wonderful district with enormous resources, can not go ahead because of its deplorable currency system, based principally on irredeemable fiat money—paper without value. The hard-working population could easily be well off. Instead, the district condemns its toilers of the ground to remain beggars eternally, simply because there is no silver available to serve as cover for the floods of irredeemable bank notes, amounting to billions of dollars, forced into circulation in Manchuria. Similar conditions exist in sundry of the interior provinces of China. The poor fish is drowning through lack of silver.

My story has come to an end. The romance of silver, however, is continuing and will lead, let us hope, to a happy ending.

STUDY OF BATTLEFIELDS FOR COMMEMORATIVE PURPOSES

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, is there on the table a message from the President?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of the act of Congress approved June 11, 1926, entitled "An act to provide for the study and investigation of battlefields in the United States for commemorative purposes," I am transmitting a communication from the Secretary of War giving a detailed report of progress made under said act, together with his recommendations for further operations.

HERBERT HOOVER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 10, 1930.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is also on the table an Executive message. Does the Senator wish to have the Senate proceed to the consideration of the Executive message?

Mr. BORAH. I do not want to have the Senate go into executive session. I ask that the message be received in open session.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the rule, the message may be received and referred without going into executive session; but it will have to be read in executive session at some time.

Mr. BORAH. Very well; I so move.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Idaho moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business under the rule.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

THE WORLD COURT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the message, as follows:

To the Senate:

I have the honor to transmit to the Senate for its consideration and action three documents concerning adherence of the United States to the Court of International Justice. I inclose also a report of November 18, 1929, by the Secretary of State. I trust the protocols may have consideration as soon as possible after the emergency relief and appropriation legislation has been disposed of.

It will be recalled that on January 27, 1926, following extended consideration, the Senate advised and gave consent to adherence to the court with five reservations; and it gave authorization to effect their acceptance by an exchange of notes. Consent to four of these reservations was promptly expressed at a meeting of the nations members of the court, and after negotiations undertaken with the approval of President Coolidge two protocols were drawn to revise the statutes of the court in order to embody this consent and also to meet the fifth reservation. The protocol of accession of the United States and the protocol of revision have now been signed by practically all the nations which are members of the court and have also already been ratified by a large majority of those nations.

The provisions of the protocols free us from any entanglement in the diplomacy of other nations. We can not be summoned before this court. We can from time to time seek its services by agreement with other nations. These protocols permit our withdrawal from the court at any time without reproach or ill will.

The movement for the establishment of such a court originated with our country. It has been supported by Presidents Wilson, Harding, and Coolidge; by Secretaries of State Hughes, Kellogg, and Stimson; it springs from the earnest seeking of our people for justice in international relations and to strengthen the foundations of peace.

Through the Kellogg-Briand pact we have pledged ourselves to the use of pacific means in settlement of all controversies. Our great Nation, so devoted to peace and justice, should lend its cooperation in this effort of the nations to establish a great agency for such pacific settlements.

HERBERT HOOVER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 10, 1930.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The message of the President, with its accompanying documents, will be printed and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. BORAH. I ask to have inserted in the RECORD at this point an editorial from the New York Evening Sun.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The editorial is as follows:

[From the New York Sun of Monday, December 1, 1930]

WHEN THE LEAGUE COURT PROTOCOL COMES OUT, KILL IT!

Viewed from the standpoint of national need, the President's decision to send the Root protocol to the Senate is unfortunate. The country had hoped to avoid an extra session of Congress. It expected that the short session begun to-day would be devoted to the necessary appropriation bills. No legislation beyond that needed to accelerate public works will aid employment. With an extra session avoided, the business of the country could proceed without undue worry to regain its feet. Men so conservative as LONGWORTH and SNELL showed willingness even to accede to a vote on Muscle Shoals in the short session if that would protect business from the peril of an extra session.

President Hoover's action appears to make it sure that the Seventy-second Congress will have to be called together in March as soon as the Seventy-first Congress has expired. Senator BORAH, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, welcomes the President's decision. He is not inclined to sidetrack the protocol. Disregarding Mr. Hoover's implied suggestion that the matter should not be "brought up in the press of other business," Senator BORAH voices bluntly his assumption that the protocol would not be sent to the Senate "if it was not the desire to have it disposed of as soon as practicable." That is logical.

If the President had desired to make certain that the League Court issue could not clog the important business of the lame-duck session it was easy to keep the papers in their pigeonhole for a year, or even longer. He has chosen to do otherwise. He has chosen to let the Senate devote the precious days of the short session—three months that include the Christmas holidays—to discussion of the Root protocol. The advocates of an extra session, no matter what their opinion of the protocol, hail his action gladly.

Such is the dark side of the picture. Let us find the brighter one. Soon or late the protocol had to come to a vote in the Senate. It has been like a dangerous animal hibernating. The temptation has been to let it sleep, perhaps to let it die of inanition. Now that it is to be pitchforked into the open, the opportunity is at hand to kill it. Whatever delays may result from its unexpected entrance on the legislative scene, whatever temporary harm or anxiety it may bring to business, at least there will be a sigh of relief if it is disposed of forever by the simple process of annihilation. If it be done quickly, then what appears now to be an unwise movement by President Hoover may be regarded in future as a stroke of political genius.

There should be no question as to the fate of the protocol in the Senate. Accepting it would mean that the Senate was eating its own words. It was after deliberate consideration and long debate that the Senate drew reservation No. 5 and attached it to the resolution which consented to adherence to the statute for the League Court. This reservation read:

"That the court shall not render any advisory opinion except publicly after due notice to all states adhering to the court and to all interested states, and after public hearing or opportunity for hearing given to any state concerned; nor shall it, without the consent of the United States, entertain any request for an advisory opinion touching any dispute or question in which the United States has or claims an interest."

Let us say in passing that adherence to the League Court under any circumstances would be a dangerous adventure. A nationwide referendum on that question probably would show that the people of the United States are as strongly opposed to joining the court as they are to joining the league itself, and the country had a "great and solemn referendum" on that question. But the propagandists were at work and the Senate became temporarily infected with the belief of the internationalists and idealists that the court was a palace in which the Princess of Peace lay sleeping, not to awaken until Uncle Sam's arrival. Hence the vote, nearly five years ago, to adhere to the court with reservations, the most important of which is quoted above.

The European statesmen who run the League of Nations declined to accept the terms of the Senate. When that was announced President Coolidge said:

"I do not intend to ask the Senate to modify its position. * * * Unless the requirements of the Senate resolution (the reservations) are met by the other interested nations I can see no prospect of this country adhering to the court."

Among the people the verdict was the same. It was generally believed that the case was ended and sealed. But the propagandists were not so easily beaten. With the blessing of the internationalists and the idealist the Hon. Elihu Root went to Europe to effect a compromise. He carried with him a formula of his own, but it fell before the swords of the diplomatists at Geneva. Whatever effort it made to retain the force of reservation No. 5 was eliminated by that astute British diplomat, Sir Cecil Hurst. Whether it was Sir Cecil who wrote the protocol which Mr. Root brought back, or Mr. Root himself, or these two eminent gentlemen in concert, the protocol emasculated the reservation. It did not—it does not—permit the United States to prohibit the submission to the court, for an advisory opinion, of a question in which we assert we have an interest. We may object, but if we insist on our objection we must get out of the court. Such withdrawal, says the Root-Hurst protocol, drawn at Geneva for acceptance by the Senate in Washington, "will follow naturally without any imputation of unfriendliness or unwillingness to co-operate generally for peace and good will." Never had words more sugar on the surface or more gall underneath. If we should object to the submission to the court of a request, put forward by another power, for an advisory opinion on the right of the United States to limit or forbid immigration on the ground of color, the only certain weight behind our objection, under the Root-Hurst protocol, would be a single vote. If we did not yield, if we continued to object, "the exercise of the powers of withdrawal provided for in article 8 hereof will follow naturally," etc. After that would come the storm of criticism, the accusation of selfishness, the deepening of hatreds which we have tried to dispel.

Considering these things, it is little wonder that the Root protocol has stayed in its pigeonhole for nearly two years. Its explosive possibilities are realized by most thinking Americans. As George Wharton Pepper said of it, it is "an arrangement which substitutes the remedy of withdrawal from the court after the mischief has been done for the salutary provision which prevents the mischief from arising." Some advocates of adherence to the court accepted it; they would accept almost anything to get us in. For most of these supporters are also advocates of American entrance into the League of Nations. As Colonel House said when the Senate passed the resolution with reservations, "it means that we have entered something like the League of Nations." We had not quite entered, for Europe refused our terms. Reservation No. 5 was the only thing that saved us from being ushered into the rear vestibule of the League of Nations. It was the only thing that prevented the United States from being entangled in the mesh of European political conflict. And now the Senate has to decide whether it shall comply with the desires of Europe, as expressed in the Root-Hurst compact at Geneva, or with the wishes of the American people.

Over and beyond the point directly at issue—the acceptance or rejection of the European substitute for reservation No. 5—is the larger issue of membership in the league court under any circumstances. Nearly five years have passed since the Senate voted for adherence with reservations. Meanwhile the peril of joining a subsidiary of the League of Nations, as Lord Robert Cecil called it, has not diminished. Conditions for peace abroad are, regrettably, no more favorable now than they were in 1925; indeed, many observers see in overproduction, national aspirations, and racial animosities the making of serious trouble. Seemingly peace is more talked of than thought of. There never was a good time for the United States to join the league or its court; this is perhaps the very worst time. We have our own problems, which none of the machinery at Geneva can help us to solve. The league and its court are thoroughly European in character. It is impossible to separate them in any consideration of the future.

It is scarcely necessary to remind informed Americans of the relationship of the court to the league. It was created by the league. It is the legal adviser of the league. Its statutes are drawn with the consent of the league. Its judges are chosen, paid, and pensioned under league auspices. Its supreme law is the covenant of the league. In the words of Representative TINKHAM, it is the bureau, organ, political instrumentality, agent, and servant of the league. It is amazing that any nation whose people rejected, by a majority of 7,000,000, a proposal to enter the League of Nations should still be faced with a proposal to enter the league court. For, as the league is a supergovernment, so is the court. David Jayne Hill passed his measured judgment on that feature of it:

"A court which judges without defined and accepted law, merely in accordance with its own sense of fitness or the decrees of a political body, is in its very nature a supergovernment, for it does not merely declare the law, which is the proper business of a court, but makes the law by its own unregulated action."

We might make friends for a day by entering the league court. We should make enemies for a generation when the time came—and it inevitably would come—when circumstances compelled us to withdraw. Let us keep what friendships we have abroad by refusing to adhere, by conducting only one government—our own—and by giving aid and counsel to others when we can do so without entangling ourselves or alienating our friends. When the league court protocol comes out of its pigeonhole and into the Senate Chamber it should meet its death. And, to make assurance doubly sure, the Senate should rescind the resolution which Geneva rejected, thus clearing the air completely of the smoke of danger.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore referred to the appropriate committees sundry nominations this day received from the President of the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Reports of committees are in order. If there be no reports of committees, the Executive Calendar is in order.

TREATY WITH CHINA

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read Executive Q, Seventy-first Congress, second session, treaty of arbitration between the United States of America and China.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, this is really a routine matter, the treaty being exactly the same in terms as treaties we have negotiated with a great number of countries.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, is there any provision in the treaty with respect to tariffs?

Mr. BORAH. No; this is purely an arbitration treaty.

The Senate as in Committee of the Whole proceeded to consider the treaty.

The treaty was reported to the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Does the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of this treaty?

Two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative, the treaty was ratified, as follows:

To the Senate:

To the end that I may receive the advice and consent of the Senate to its ratification, I transmit herewith a treaty of arbitration between the United States of America and the Republic of China, signed at Washington on June 27, 1930.

HERBERT HOOVER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 28, 1930.

The PRESIDENT:

The undersigned, the Secretary of State, has the honor to lay before the President, with a view to its transmission to the Senate to receive the advice and consent of that body to ratification, if his judgment approve thereof, a treaty of arbitration between the United States of America and the Republic of China, signed at Washington on June 27, 1930.

Respectfully submitted.

H. L. STIMSON.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, June 27, 1930.

The United States of America and the Republic of China, Determined to prevent so far as in their power lies any interruption in the peaceful relations now happily existing between the two nations;

Desirous of reaffirming their adherence to the policy of submitting to impartial decision all justiciable controversies that may arise between them; and

Eager by their example not only to demonstrate their condemnation of war as an instrument of national policy in

their mutual relations, but also to hasten the time when the perfection of international arrangements for the pacific settlement of international disputes shall have eliminated forever the possibility of war among any of the Powers of the world;

Have decided to conclude a treaty of arbitration and for that purpose they have appointed as their respective Plenipotentiaries:

The President of the United States of America:

Mr. Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of State of the United States of America; and

The President of the National Government of the Republic of China:

Mr. Chao-Chu Wu, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the Republic of China to the United States of America;

Who, having communicated to one another their full powers found to be in good and due form, have agreed upon and concluded the following articles:

ARTICLE I

All differences relating to international matters in which the High Contracting Parties are concerned by virtue of a claim of right made by one against the other under treaty or otherwise, which it has not been possible to adjust by diplomacy, which have not been adjusted as a result of reference to the Permanent International Commission constituted pursuant to the treaty signed at Washington September 15, 1914, and which are justiciable in their nature by reason of being susceptible of decision by the application of the principles of law or equity, shall be submitted to the Permanent Court of Arbitration established at The Hague by the Convention of October 18, 1907, or to some other competent tribunal, as shall be decided in each case by special agreement, which special agreement shall provide, if necessary, for the organization of such tribunal, shall define its powers, shall state the question or questions at issue, and shall settle the terms of reference.

The special agreement in each case shall be made on the part of the United States of America by the President of the United States of America by and with the advice and consent of the Senate thereof, and on the part of China in accordance with its constitutional law.

ARTICLE II

The provisions of this treaty shall not be invoked in respect of any dispute the subject matter of which

- a) is within the domestic jurisdiction of either of the High Contracting Parties;
- b) involves the interests of third Parties;
- c) depends upon or involves the maintenance of the traditional attitude of the United States concerning American questions, commonly described as the Monroe doctrine,
- d) depends upon or involves the observance of the obligations of China in accordance with the Covenant of the League of Nations.

ARTICLE III

The present treaty, in English, Chinese and French, shall be ratified by the President of the United States of America, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate thereof, and by the National Government of the Republic of China in accordance with Chinese constitutional law. The English and Chinese texts shall have equal force, but in case of divergence the French text shall prevail.

The ratifications shall be exchanged at Washington as soon as possible, and the treaty shall take effect on the date of the exchange of ratifications. It shall thereafter remain in force continuously unless and until terminated by one year's written notice given by either High Contracting Party to the other.

In faith whereof, the respective Plenipotentiaries have signed this treaty, in duplicate, in the English, Chinese and French languages, and hereunto affixed their seals.

Done at Washington this 27th day of June, one thousand nine hundred and thirty, corresponding to the 27th day of the sixth month of the nineteenth year of the Republic of China.

[SEAL]
[SEAL]

HENRY L. STIMSON
CHAO-CHU WU

BOARD OF MEDIATION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Samuel E. Winslow, of Massachusetts, to be reappointed a member of the Board of Mediation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed, and the President will be notified.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Frank McManamy, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed, and the President will be notified.

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I direct the attention of the Senator from Utah to the fact that we have reached the Tariff Commission nominations.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that the nominations may go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. BORAH. The Tariff Commission nominations are to go over?

Mr. SMOOT. I have asked that they go over.

Mr. BORAH. Very well.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will be passed over.

BUREAU OF NARCOTICS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Harry J. Anslinger, of Pennsylvania, to be Commissioner of the Bureau of Narcotics.

Mr. COPELAND. I ask that this nomination may go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nomination will be passed over.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Public Health Service.

Mr. SMOOT. These nominations are all regular promotions, and I ask that they be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc, and the President will be notified.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. PHIPPS. I ask that the nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc, and the President will be notified.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR EMERGENCY CONSTRUCTION

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I move that the Senate return to the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business, the unfinished business being the bill (H. R. 14804) making supplemental appropriations to provide for emergency construction on certain public works during the remainder of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, with a view to increasing employment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. BLAINE], the Chair understanding that three amendments proposed by the Senator from Wisconsin have been combined, to be acted upon in a single vote.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let the amendments be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments will be read for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. The junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. BLAINE] offers the following amendment: On page 2, line 10, to strike out the word "a" before the word "temporary," and following the word "temporary" to strike out the words "advance of"; and, on line 12, after the numerals "\$80,000,000" and the colon, to strike out the proviso down to and including the word "supplemented," in line 18; and, in line 18, to strike out the word "further" following the word "Provided."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is upon agreeing to the amendments by a single vote.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I ask that the provision of the bill be now read as it would read if the amendments were adopted down to the second proviso.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Federal-aid highway system: For apportionment to the several States under the provisions of the Federal highway act, as amended, as temporary funds to meet the provisions of such act as to State funds required on Federal-aid projects, \$80,000,000.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Is that the way the Senator from Wisconsin desires that it should read? It does not mean anything to me in that language.

Mr. BLAINE. I was about to suggest that the Senator's proposed amendment be added.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I could understand that, if the Senator would strike out everything after the word "amended" in line 10, down to and including the word "projects" in line 12, but I do not understand the significance of the bill as it would read as amended, "As temporary funds to meet the provisions of such act as to State funds required on Federal-aid projects." That necessarily implies that the State is to provide its portion of the funds, and my amendment would negative that idea.

It occurs to me, if I may make the suggestion to the Senator, that his purpose would be accomplished by striking out all of the paragraph commencing with the word "as" in line 10, down to and including the word "projects" in line 12, and then if that should prevail, if the Senator desired, he might add the amendment suggested by me, as follows:

Provided, That the States respectively shall not be required to provide any sum for the purposes contemplated by the said act as a condition of the receipt of any funds hereby appropriated.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, in view of the Senator's suggestion made some time ago, I am quite in agreement with his suggestion now that the words to which he calls attention be stricken out and that the words he has read should be added.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Fess in the chair). The Senator accepts the amendment?

Mr. BLAINE. I accept the suggested amendment proposed by the Senator from Montana.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, if this amendment now suggested should prevail, would it mean that \$80,000,000 would be given to the States?

Mr. BLAINE. Eighty million dollars will go to the States on Federal-aid projects, to be administered by State authority under the Federal aid act. It is a temporary appropriation, presumed to be in the interest of unemployment, of course.

Mr. COPELAND. Of course that is a part of the bill as it is here written. Is the Senator seeking to amend the bill so that there will be no obligation on the part of the State to make up for that advance by a decrease in future appropriations?

Mr. BLAINE. The Senator is not seeking any such purpose. The purpose of the Senator is to do what public officials have been pretending they intended to do; that is, to afford public funds out of the United States Treasury for the purpose of construction of public works. That is the purpose. I assume that each State will make its own provision with respect to that and other matters.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, frankly, I do not understand this measure. As it is written and as it passed the House, \$80,000,000 would be advanced in the usual way to the States and matched by them. But in the apportionment for each State in the future the money received under this arrangement would be accounted for, and the amount of the appropriation received by each State decreased; in other words, the National Treasury would be reimbursed for the advance. Does the plan of the Senator contemplate now an outright gift of \$80,000,000, regardless of its purpose? I am in harmony with the purpose. Does the Senator propose to provide for a gift of \$80,000,000 to the States?

Mr. BLAINE. Very frankly, I propose to have the Federal Government discharge its obligation in the present crisis;

that is, to appropriate money out of the United States Treasury for the purpose of advancing public works. I am not discussing what the States should do or what they should not do. I am emphasizing what the Federal Government should do. We are pretending to do it, but I am proposing that the Federal Government actually do it.

Mr. COPELAND. I can not see, to be frank, what the difference is, so far as the immediate relief is concerned, whether it is done the way the Senator proposes or whether it is done in the way the bill proposes. If I grasp the intention of the Senator, it is to give to the States \$80,000,000, but with no obligation in the future on the part of the States to return the \$80,000,000.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, it is not a gift to the States in any manner whatever. This is an appropriation, as proposed by the amendment, of \$80,000,000, to be used on Federal-aid projects in the respective States. The States or the Federal Government have the machinery already set up for the administration of this fund, and it is merely a proposal that the Federal Government discharge its obligation, so far as this provision could discharge it in the present crisis.

Mr. COPELAND. If the Senator had offered no amendment, if this legislation were to go through the Senate as it passed the House, under exactly the same operation of the machinery of administration, there would be spent \$80,000,000 in the various States, but what the Senator proposes is not to be more generous with the States as regards appropriating the \$80,000,000, but what he proposes is that the States shall not be held responsible for that in the future, and that in the future they will get exactly the same amount as if they had not had this appropriation.

Mr. BLAINE. I am not discussing the degree of generosity to the States. I am discussing the Federal Government's obligation in the present crisis, and if the Federal Government, as indicated by the President and the administration, is to render aid, we ought to render aid, and not simply compel the States to render aid. Under the bill as originally drafted, not a single dollar would be appropriated out of the Federal Treasury which would not be returned to the Federal Treasury; in other words, the Federal Government would do nothing except to say, "We will lend the States this money. You must meet it, and you can administer it under the Federal aid law, but you must return it by way of deduction of future allotments." So that, as a matter of fact, the Federal Government, under the bill as reported by the committee, would contribute nothing whatever.

Mr. COPELAND. Let me ask the Senator a question. If this measure should be amended as he suggests, would there be any obligation on the States to match this \$80,000,000?

Mr. BLAINE. I can not answer for the several States. I know my own State expended in the last fiscal year something like \$50,000,000 on highways, an amount almost equal to the sum proposed here to be loaned to the States. In one year the State of Wisconsin, as I recall the figures, spent nearly \$50,000,000 on highways. Here the Federal Government is going to spread all over the 48 States an expenditure of only \$80,000,000. That is all my amendment provides.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the senior Senator from New York yield to his colleague?

Mr. COPELAND. Certainly.

Mr. WAGNER. I think the answer to the inquiry of my colleague is that the States under the proposed amendment are not obligated to match the \$80,000,000. The \$80,000,000 is an outright appropriation by the Federal Government for aid in the construction of State roads, to be allocated as the Federal highway law provides, except that it removes the obligation of the States to match by an equal sum whatever sum the Federal Government contributes.

Mr. COPELAND. I want to call my colleague's attention to the fact that if the bill passes with the amendment proposed by the Senator from Wisconsin, the State of New York will pay \$25,000,000 of it in addition to future sums

which are allocated in the usual way for the improvement of highways.

Mr. WAGNER. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me before we pass from that matter—

Mr. COPELAND. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I take very distinct exception to the characterization of this matter as a gift to the States. Under the provisions of the general Federal law we have declared the policy to be that the Government of the United States as well as the States owe an obligation in the matter of the construction of post roads and military roads. That is the basis. Under the existing law the obligation of the Federal Government in that matter has been recognized to be substantially 50 per cent. That is the settled policy of the Government.

In view of a particular emergency which now exists it is suggested that the Federal Government ought to assume a little larger proportion of the burden of constructing these post and military roads. It is not a matter of a gift to the States any more than under the present law a gift of 50 per cent is made to the States. Nobody ever thought of that statute as providing a gift to the States. It contemplates the joint action of the Federal and the State Governments in the construction of those necessary roads, necessary by reason of the development of a means of transportation and the necessities of our people. Here is a crisis just now, and in this particular crisis and for this particular purpose it is suggested by the Blaine amendment that there ought to be a little further contribution toward the general end by the Federal Government.

Another thing, Mr. President, of course we have heard at all stages of this legislation, as well as at all stages of legislation in relation to the income tax, that the State of New York is discriminated against; that it pays a very heavy proportion. So it does. But so good an economist as either of the Senators from that great State will, of course, recognize that that is distributed over the whole country, although it originally comes from taxpayers who happen to reside and make their income-tax returns in the State of New York. Furthermore, they will equally realize that when an industry grows rather large in any one of the States its headquarters are immediately transferred to the city of New York. That has been the case with any number of industries which have been developed in my State and in the neighboring States, and they pay their income taxes not infrequently in the city of New York instead of in the State in which they are domiciled.

I think we ought not to be deterred from doing the right thing in this matter by reason of the fact that in the first instance a very large proportion of the tax is paid in the collection district of the State of New York or the State of Pennsylvania or any other Eastern State.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, will my colleague yield further?

Mr. COPELAND. Certainly.

Mr. WAGNER. The Senator from Montana has not heard me utter a single word of opposition by reason of the fact that New York would be called upon to pay a larger share of the appropriation than it would receive. The generous manner in which the citizens of my State have responded to the call to help the hungry and unsheltered should convince anyone that they stand ready to carry their full portion of the burden of this emergency.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I was replying to a suggestion made in the course of the debate, but I do not recall whether by the Senator or his colleague, that the State of New York would have to pay \$25,000,000 of the \$80,000,000.

Mr. WAGNER. No doubt that is true, but that is no ground for opposition. What we are trying to do, as I understand it, is to accelerate, if we can, the construction of public works in order to take up the slack of the economic depression.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Quite so.

Mr. WAGNER. If we make this \$80,000,000 contribution a matter of State aid, so the State would have to match it,

are we not going to accelerate the construction of public roads to the amount of \$160,000,000 instead of getting only the amount now proposed by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. BLAINE] and limiting it possibly to \$80,000,000?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I again insist that the States themselves ought to be permitted to exercise their own discretion about that matter, but the bill itself provides that it need not be met by the States until during a period of five years after 1933, so it does not contemplate the expenditure of \$160,000,000 at all, as the bill now stands.

Mr. WAGNER. I am sure the Senator does not mean to make that statement.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Of course I do.

Mr. WAGNER. It contemplates eventually the expenditure of \$160,000,000.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Not at all.

Mr. WAGNER. The States have to match this amount sooner or later.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Later it will be taken away from the amount they would be obliged to contribute, so it does not increase the total amount at the end of the period at all.

Mr. WAGNER. It takes from the States the allocation which they otherwise would get.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. At that time they will get just \$80,000,000 less, so the aggregate amount will be the same in the end. It simply advances the \$80,000,000 which will be spent now instead of being spent in the 5-year period after 1933.

Mr. SMOOT. That is the case if the House provision remains as it is, but if the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin is adopted, then the States are relieved from that requirement.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I was simply addressing myself to a statement made by the junior Senator from New York that the bill standing as it is means the expenditure of \$160,000,000 instead of \$80,000,000. That is not correct.

Mr. SMOOT. No; that is not correct.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. COPELAND. Certainly.

Mr. BLAINE. The Senator made the suggestion that his State would be called upon to pay \$25,000,000 of the \$80,000,000. If that is an objection on the part of the senior Senator from New York, then the same objection would apply in the same way to the \$80,000,000 appropriation as proposed by the committee report. New York will receive its proportionate share under either proposal. It will pay the same amount toward Federal aid under either proposal.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I am familiar with the argument which I have just heard made in response to a statement of the Senator from New York to the effect that New York pays this large percentage of the taxes. I have heard that argument every time such a suggestion has been made. But what is proposed now is that the States shall get \$80,000,000, and there is to be no credit to the Federal Government in the future for this advance. I want the Senate to understand that that is the proposal. It is not an advance to the States. It is a gift to them. If it came to the question of relief of unemployment or an advance such as the bill proposes, I would not object to any amount the Senate might choose to insert in the bill, whether \$80,000,000 or \$180,000,000; but I think we ought to realize that if we accept the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin we are taking that much money out of the Treasury which will never be replaced.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. COPELAND. I do.

Mr. COUZENS. I would like to have the Senator explain how it is a gift, because all other money advanced by the Federal Government for State aid on roads is not returned to the Federal Government. It is simply matched. If it is

a gift under the pending bill, then it is a gift in every appropriation bill. As a matter of fact, it is a gift in either case because the money is never returned to the Federal Government.

Mr. COPELAND. There may be States that will do no work at all and not take advantage of the situation, but they will be taxed just the same and have to pay their proportion. The issue is clear. It is for the Senate to decide whether it will make a free gift of \$80,000,000 to the States of the Union or whether it will follow the terms of the bill and have such States as make use of their proportion of the fund charged against future appropriations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment as modified will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. BLAINE] proposes to strike out, on page 2, line 10, all after the word "amended," down to the numerals "\$80,000,000," in line 12, and to strike out the proviso following the numerals "\$80,000,000," and insert the following proviso:

Provided, That the States respectively shall not be required to provide any sum for the purposes contemplated by the said act as a condition of the receipt of any funds hereby appropriated.

So as to read:

For apportionment to the several States under the provisions of the Federal highway act, as amended, \$80,000,000: *Provided, That the States respectively shall not be required to provide any sum for the purposes contemplated by the said act as a condition of the receipt of any funds hereby appropriated.*

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I can only emphasize practically what the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND] said. We need not call this a gift to the States. It is a direct appropriation of \$80,000,000 to be distributed among the States in accordance with the terms of the highway act, and that is all there is to it. As I said, we need not call it a gift or anything of the kind. It is a direct appropriation to the States of \$80,000,000 to be apportioned among them according to the terms of the general highway act. The question is whether the Senate desires to do that.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Washington a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. JONES. Certainly.

Mr. GEORGE. Is it not a mere advance against future appropriations?

Mr. JONES. Not at all. It is a direct appropriation now.

Mr. GEORGE. Is not that the substance of it?

Mr. JONES. That is the proposed amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. It is a direct appropriation, but really in the nature of an advance?

Mr. JONES. According to the amendment which is proposed, the \$80,000,000 would simply be a direct appropriation to be apportioned among the States according to the national highway act.

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, according to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. GEORGE. I think the Senator is entirely correct. I thought he was speaking of the original bill.

Mr. JONES. Oh, no; I was speaking of the Blaine amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. Under the original bill is it not a mere advance against future appropriations?

Mr. JONES. That is true; to be immediately available to meet the unemployment situation.

Mr. GEORGE. May I ask the Senator if the actual effect of the bill as it stands will not be the expenditure of as much money as the States are required to spend during the period intervening between 1933 and 1938, five years after 1933, unless the States should voluntarily see fit to contribute?

Mr. JONES. As I understand that statement, I think it is a correct statement of the situation.

Mr. GEORGE. As I interpret it, this advance as made in the bill as reported might result in the expenditure of \$80,000,000 less upon Federal-aid highways of the country during the period.

Mr. JONES. After 1933 it is being repaid, not from State treasuries but out of money that we might appropriate under the Federal highway act for the various States.

Mr. GEORGE. Whether the amendment is accepted or rejected, the \$80,000,000 becomes immediately available to the States without any action upon their part so far as present matching is concerned?

Mr. JONES. Oh, yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. BLAINE. Let us have the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DENEEN (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from California [Mr. SHORTRIDGE] and will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BLEASE. I have a pair with the Senator from Maine [Mr. GOULD]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. SIMMONS. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET], who is absent. I do not know how he would vote if present, but I will transfer my pair to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and vote "yea."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore (after having voted in the negative). The present occupant of the chair has a general pair with the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD]. He transfers that pair to the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. GREENE] and permits his vote to stand.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. My colleague [Mr. WHEELER] is absent on account of illness. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. FESS. I desire to announce the general pair of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. HEBERT] with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS]. I am not advised as to how either of those Senators would vote on this question were they present.

I also desire to announce the general pair of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. PINE] with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON].

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish to announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. STECK] are necessarily absent from the city.

I also desire to announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANDELL], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HAWES], the Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent from the Senate on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—32

Ashurst	Dill	La Follette	Sheppard
Black	Frazier	McKellar	Shipstead
Blaine	Harris	McMaster	Simmons
Brookhart	Harrison	Norbeck	Smith
Caraway	Hayden	Norris	Stephens
Connally	Heflin	Nye	Thomas, Idaho
Couzens	Howell	Pittman	Walsh, Mont.
Cutting	Kendrick	Robinson, Ark.	Williamson

NAYS—43

Bingham	George	Keyes	Robinson, Ind.
Brock	Glass	King	Schall
Bulkeley	Glenn	McGill	Smoot
Capper	Goff	McNary	Steiwer
Carey	Goldsborough	Metcalf	Townsend
Copeland	Hale	Morrow	Vandenberg
Dale	Hastings	Moses	Wagner
Davis	Hatfield	Oddie	Walcott
Deneen	Johnson	Patterson	Walsh, Mass.
Fess	Jones	Phipps	Watson
Fletcher	Kean	Reed	

NOT VOTING—21

Barkley	Gould	Ransdell	Tydings
Bleas	Greene	Shortridge	Waterman
Borah	Hawes	Steck	Wheeler
Bratton	Hebert	Swanson	
Broussard	Overman	Thomas, Okla.	
Gillett	Pine	Trammell	

So the amendments proposed by Mr. BLAINE were rejected.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk, which I ask to have the clerk read. It should come in following the word "appropriations," in line 13, on page 4.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan offers an amendment, which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, line 13, after the word "appropriations," it is proposed to insert:

Provided, That every contract made under the provisions of this bill to which the United States, any Territory, or the District of Columbia is a party, and every such contract made for or on behalf of the United States or any Territory or said District which may require or involve the employment of laborers or mechanics shall contain a provision that the contractor or any subcontractor contracting for any part of said work contemplated shall employ as laborers or mechanics only persons who have been living for at least 90 days prior to the commencement of said work of the district, city, town, or village within which such work is being done, if being done within a district, city, town, or village, or of the State or Territory within which the work is being done if outside the limits of a district, city, town, or village, if such laborers or mechanics are available within such district, city, town, village, State, or Territory.

Every such contract shall further provide that any such contractor or subcontractor shall pay to each laborer or mechanic doing any part of the work contemplated by the contract in the employ of the contractor or any subcontractor contracting for any part of said work contemplated not less than the highest rate of wages for the class of work to be done by said laborer or mechanic prevailing in the district, city, town, or village within which said work is being done, if within a district, city, town, or village, or in the State or Territory (outside of cities, towns, and villages therein) if the work is not being done within a district, city, town, or village. The word city shall include any incorporated city and its suburbs.

That the provisions of section 1 of the act of June 19, 1912 (37 Stat. 137), commonly known as the 8-hour law, as to penalties, reports of violations by inspectors, withholding of penalties, and appeals shall apply in all cases of violations of the provisions of this bill.

That the provisions of section 2 of the act of June 19, 1912 (37 Stat. 137), shall apply to the provisions of this bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Oregon desires that the Senate take a recess or adjournment soon, I should like to have him make the motion now rather than go ahead with the pending amendment.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jones] is in charge of the bill, and it is far from my desire to have it taken away from him. I should like to have his view regarding the suggestion.

Mr. JONES. Whatever the Senator from Oregon would like to do is entirely agreeable to me. I had hoped that we would be able to dispose of the pending measure to-day, but I assume, from what the Senator from Michigan says, that his amendment will require some considerable time, and, if the Senator desires a recess at this hour, well and good.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. COUZENS. I yield.

RECESS

Mr. McNARY. I understand the Senator from Michigan is not prepared to go forward to-night with the discussion of his amendment, but desires to have it printed and lie on the table. Therefore, I move that the Senate take a recess until to-morrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Thursday, December 11, 1930, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 10 (legislative day of December 9), 1930

SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE

George D. Andrews, jr., of Tennessee, now a Foreign Service officer, unclassified, and a vice consul of career, to be also a secretary in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America.

DISTRICT ATTORNEY OF THE CANAL ZONE

Joseph J. McGuigan, of Pennsylvania, for appointment as district attorney of the Canal Zone, provided for by the Panama Canal act, approved August 24, 1912, as amended, vice Charles J. Riley, resigned.

REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE

Henry A. Morgan, of Arizona, to be Register of the Land Office at Phoenix, Ariz. (Reappointment.)

RECORDER OF DEEDS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Jefferson S. Coage, of Delaware, to be recorder of deeds, District of Columbia, to succeed Arthur S. Froe, resigned. (Mr. Coage is now serving under a recess appointment.)

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 10 (legislative day of December 9), 1930

MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF MEDIATION

Samuel E. Winslow to be a member of the Board of Mediation.

MEMBER OF THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Frank McManamy to be a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Clinton T. Messner to be senior dental surgeon.

Robert L. Robinson to be dental surgeon.

Ralph E. Tarbett to be sanitary engineer.

Leslie C. Frank to be sanitary engineer.

Edgar B. Scott to be assistant pharmacist.

Edwin M. Holt to be assistant pharmacist.

William C. Billings to be medical director.

Gustave M. Corput to be medical director.

John S. Boggess to be medical director.

John T. Burkhalter to be medical director.

Edward R. Pelikan to be passed assistant surgeon.

Ralph B. Snavely to be passed assistant surgeon.

Langdon R. White to be passed assistant surgeon.

Joseph F. Van Ackeren to be passed assistant surgeon.

Warren F. Draper to be senior surgeon.

Lewis R. Thompson to be senior surgeon.

William C. Parker to be passed assistant dental surgeon.

James F. Lewis to be assistant dental surgeon.

Charles Wardell Stiles to be medical director.

William S. Terribery to be medical director.

Joseph A. Le Prince to be senior sanitary engineer.

Thomas H. D. Griffiths to be surgeon.

William L. Smith to be surgeon.

Oswald E. Denney to be surgeon.

Oliver C. Wenger to be surgeon.

Stephen A. De Martini to be surgeon.

John M. Lowrey to be surgeon.

Egbert M. Townsend to be surgeon.

Norman Y. Hooper to be dental surgeon.

Alf Einar Nannestad to be dental surgeon.

Robert C. Stewart to be dental surgeon.

William T. Wright to be dental surgeon.

Frank C. Cady to be dental surgeon.

Ozias Paquin, jr., to be dental surgeon.

Daniel B. Newell to be dental surgeon.

Charles W. Wekenman to be dental surgeon.

Eugene C. Stamm to be dental surgeon.

Stanmore P. Marshall to be dental surgeon.

William O. Boss to be dental surgeon.

H. Trendley Dean to be dental surgeon.

Carl Pickett to be passed assistant dental surgeon.

Frederick W. Harper to be passed assistant dental surgeon.

Allen M. Perkins to be passed assistant dental surgeon.

John K. Hoskins to be sanitary engineer.

Harold W. Streeter to be sanitary engineer.

Harry R. Crohurst to be sanitary engineer.

Harry B. Hommon to be sanitary engineer.

Abraham W. Fuchs to be sanitary engineer.

William H. W. Komp to be sanitary engineer.

Lawrence M. Fisher to be sanitary engineer.
Howard N. Old to be sanitary engineer.
Frank R. Shaw to be sanitary engineer.
Leonard Greenburg to be sanitary engineer.
Arthur L. Dopmeyer to be passed assistant sanitary engineer.

Edmund C. Sullivan to be passed assistant sanitary engineer.

Arthur P. Miller to be passed assistant sanitary engineer.
Frederic J. Moss to be passed assistant sanitary engineer.
John R. Murdock to be passed assistant surgeon.
Elmer A. Carberry to be passed assistant surgeon.
Roy R. Jones to be passed assistant surgeon.
Calvin C. Applewhite to be passed assistant surgeon.
Roy E. Bodet to be passed assistant surgeon.
Frank V. Meriwether to be passed assistant surgeon.
Walter G. Nelson to be passed assistant surgeon.
Hiram J. Bush to be passed assistant surgeon.
Houston G. Foster to be passed assistant surgeon.
Samuel J. Hall to be passed assistant surgeon.
Edgar W. Norris to be passed assistant surgeon.
Donald P. Ross to be passed assistant surgeon.
Aubrey E. Snow to be passed assistant surgeon.
Richard B. Holt to be passed assistant surgeon.
Henry A. Johnson to be passed assistant sanitary engineer.
Omar C. Hopkins to be assistant sanitary engineer.
William L. Stearns to be assistant pharmacist.
Frank L. Gibson to be assistant pharmacist.
Newton C. Comfort to be assistant pharmacist.
Carl Stier to be assistant pharmacist.
Clarence H. Bierman to be assistant pharmacist.
Walter H. Keen to be assistant pharmacist.
Raymond D. Kinsey to be assistant pharmacist.
Thomas C. Armstrong to be assistant pharmacist.

POSTMASTERS

GEORGIA

Gladys E. Love, Marshallville.

MAINE

Edward H. Snow, Blue Hill.
Harland G. Hoffses, Jefferson.
Nettie A. True, New Gloucester.

RHODE ISLAND

Oscar R. Parr, Chepachet.
James F. Harrod, Wallum Lake.

WISCONSIN

Edgar Leissring, New Butler.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 10, 1930

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, the creator of all things holy and eternal, we would learn of Thee. Teach us, Father, that there is no way to a higher and nobler life except the path of duty and the fulfillment of the offices of a good man and an honest citizen. Make these our passion and our pride, for if we fail our labor will be like a cast-off scroll—unread forever. Do Thou protect us as a nation from blind drift and the sunless gulfs of anarchy, and fortify us with wisdom and the knowledge of the truth. Subdue and defeat the misguided and rebellious aliens of our country who would substitute for our representative government the false network of communistic vagaries and cause the social order to be overwhelmed and cast into fresh confusion. O God, stay Thou the elements in our land whose purpose is godless and whose plans are perilous. We are so grateful to-day for the symbolic teaching of our flag—with its stars of light, with its bars of white, and with the red of our Nation's sacrifice. We lift it to-day as an emblem of all that is great

and holy in the magna charta of our Christian faith, and may it become an abiding reality at the very heart of the Republic. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

DROUGHT-RELIEF RESOLUTION

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Senate has passed the drought-relief resolution, the House Committee on Agriculture has reported it; and in view of the pressing emergency which exists, would it not be the proper course for the House to take up the Senate resolution and table the House report at this time.

The SPEAKER. It could only be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. ASWELL. Will the Speaker recognize any Member other than the chairman to make that request?

Mr. SNELL. Is not that rather unusual?

Mr. TILSON. In the absence of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, I do not think the gentleman from Louisiana ought to press this matter. The gentleman from Iowa seems not to be on the floor just at this moment.

Mr. ASWELL. Does not the gentleman recognize the emergency and the importance of immediate action?

The SPEAKER. As a matter of fact, the Senate bill is not before the House.

Mr. ASWELL. Is that the Speaker's ruling?

The SPEAKER. The bill has not been messaged over.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 211. Joint resolution for the relief of farmers in the drought and/or storm stricken areas of the United States.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. ASWELL. To make a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ASWELL. Is the Senate bill now before the House?

The SPEAKER. The Senate bill is on the Speaker's table.

Mr. ASWELL. Will the Speaker recognize any Member other than the chairman to make a request to take up the Senate bill now?

The SPEAKER. The Chair has always endeavored to maintain the dignity of Calendar Wednesday in so far as possible, and, therefore, would not be inclined to recognize any gentleman to make such a request, in view of Calendar Wednesday business.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

The SPEAKER. To-day is Calendar Wednesday, and the Clerk will call the committees.

Mr. SANDERS of New York (when the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads was called). Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 6603) to provide a shorter workday on Saturday for postal employees, and for other purposes, which bill is on the Union Calendar.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York calls up a bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Accordingly the House automatically resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6603) to provide a shorter work day on Saturday for postal employees, and for other purposes, with Mr. HOOPER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6603, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That hereafter when the needs of the service require supervisory employees, special clerks, clerks, and laborers

in first and second class post offices, and employees of the motor-vehicle service, and carriers in the City Delivery Service and in the village delivery service, and employees of the Railway Mail Service, to perform service in excess of four hours on Saturday they shall be allowed compensatory time for such service on one day within five working days next succeeding the Saturday on which the excess service was performed: *Provided*, That employees who are granted compensatory time on Saturday for work performed the preceding Sunday or the preceding holiday shall be given the benefits of this act on one day within five working days following the Saturday when said compensatory time was granted: *Provided further*, That the Postmaster General may, if the exigencies of the service require it, authorize the payment of overtime for service in excess of four hours on the last three Saturdays in the calendar year in lieu of compensatory time: *And provided further*, That for the purpose of extending the benefits of this act to railway postal clerks the service of said railway postal clerks assigned to road duty shall be based on an average not exceeding 7 hours and 20 minutes per day for 306 days per annum, including a proper allowance for all service required on lay-off periods as provided in Post Office Department circular letter No. 1348, dated May 21, 1921; and railway postal clerks required to perform service in excess of 7 hours and 20 minutes daily, as herein provided, shall be paid in cash at the annual rate of pay or granted compensatory time, at their option, for such overtime.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, in line 3, strike out the word "hereafter."

On page 2, in line 20, strike out the figures "21" and insert "12."

On page 3, after the word "time," in line 1, insert: "This act shall take effect at the beginning of the second quarter after its passage."

And amend the title.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Chairman, before we go into this matter I would like to have some arrangement made as to time.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule there are two hours for general debate, one hour to be controlled by the gentleman from New York and one hour to be controlled by whoever may be in opposition to the bill and who desires recognition, preference, of course, being given to members of the committee.

Mr. MEAD. There are no members of the committee here who are opposed to the bill, and as the ranking minority member of the committee I ask for recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any member of the committee who is opposed to the bill and who desires recognition under the rule? If not, the Chair will recognize the gentleman from New York [Mr. MEAD].

Mr. MEAD. For how long?

The CHAIRMAN. For one hour, under the rule.

Mr. SANDERS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY].

Mr. KELLY. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, this measure provides for a 44-hour week in the Postal Service. At present postal employees work on a basis of 8 hours a day 6 days a week, or 48 hours a week.

There has been no change in hours of labor for postal employees for 18 years. In 1913 the measure known as the "8 hours in 10" went into force.

Under this measure postal employees who are required to work on Saturday afternoons will, wherever possible, be given a compensating period of leisure during the next five days. Thus there will not be curtailment of service and yet each worker will have a working week four hours shorter than at present.

Since 1924 the Post Office Department has encouraged the practice of granting a half day off on Saturday wherever the postmaster decided it could be effected. The last regulation on the subject was issued on March 18, 1930, and was as follows:

Postmasters at first and second class offices are requested to arrange such curtailment of work on Saturdays as is consistent with the lesser amount of mail received Saturday afternoons and the custom of early closing by local business houses.

In many offices it has been found possible to maintain adequate service on Saturdays with clerical and carrier schedules reduced to 4, 5, and 6 hours, thus by good management providing a partial half holiday without any material increase in operating expense.

A study of each section in these offices will reveal that while no uniform hours of service on Saturdays can be established, it is possible to arrange schedules so as most employees can be given a shorter tour. In communities where it is the custom of business

houses to close at noon on some day of the week other than Saturday postmasters should curtail accordingly and require full time on all other days.

ARCH COLEMAN,
First Assistant Postmaster General.

With discretion in the hands of many individuals varying conditions were inevitable. In perhaps one-fourth of the offices affected the employees were granted the half holiday on Saturday. Complaints from those who did not have the same schedule as these more fortunate workers have been coming in. There is but one way to equitably and permanently deal with the situation, and that is by legislation which gives to every worker what some enjoy as a matter of favor.

The expense involved will depend upon the number of additional employees needed to absorb the time which can not be covered by granting compensatory time. No one can accurately estimate that expense. The fact that one-fourth of the offices have established the system without any additional cost would indicate that when the entire service is covered the expense will not be great.

However, every dollar spent will go as wages to those who would not otherwise be employed. If the estimate of a former First Assistant Postmaster General is correct, it will require \$6,000,000 to give every worker in the service a 44-hour week and pay the additional employees necessary to perform all the service required.

Mr. Chairman, there are two unanswerable arguments for the enactment of this bill without delay. One is that through increased efficiency and productivity these workers have well earned this reduction in hours. That argument I stressed especially in my report on a similar bill when it was placed on the House Calendar in the Seventieth Congress, February 9, 1929.

Another argument now is just as compelling. That is that shorter hours in all industry is an economic necessity and the United States Government should set the example now.

As to the increased productivity, a marvelous showing has been made by postal workers in the past 17 years. It can be calculated through comparison of revenues and also pieces handled.

In 1913 the total postal personnel, including all having contractual relations, was 301,714. These employees brought in \$266,619,000.

In 1930 exactly the same number of workers produced \$580,000,000 in revenue.

Thus, measured by revenues, the postal worker of 1930 produced more than twice as much revenue as in 1913. In other words, the average worker in 1930 did as much in one hour as the postal worker of 1913 accomplished in two hours. A 24-hour work week in 1930 would have meant more production than a 48-hour week 17 years earlier. Surely everyone will admit that such a record is warrant for at least a reduction of four hours per week.

Perhaps some will argue that conditions in 1913 were so different that they should not be compared with 1930. The fact is that in 1913 the speed, precision, and efficiency with which the mails were handled made a record which amazed all who observed the system in operation.

However, that was under pre-war conditions, so let us take a later date. Charles F. Trotter, superintendent of post-office service, in a public address in 1929 said:

Eight years ago, on July 1, 1921, there were 66,789 employees in first and second class post offices, including clerks, supervisory employees, but not including letter carriers or motor-vehicle service employees. That was one employee for every \$6,050 of postal receipts. On the same date in 1928 there were 78,133 employees, or one for every \$7,930 of postal receipts. In other words, in 1928 each employee, through greater industry and increased efficiency, and there can be no other explanation of it, was turning out 31 per cent more work than in 1921.

Let me state it another way. If the output per capita had been the same in 1928 as it was in 1921, then in 1928, instead of having 78,133 employees, we would have needed 102,354, or 24,221 more than were actually used to carry on the work. That means we made a saving of 24,221 employees on account of increased efficiency. That great saving can not be ascribed to the introduction of labor-saving devices introduced into the service in those seven years. The credit belongs to the men and women of the service.

Mr. Chairman, that is a clear-cut statement from a postal administrator with many years of personal contact with the service. If his calculations had covered the entire postal personnel the results would have shown the same tremendously increased productivity.

Gen. Herbert M. Lord, Director of the Budget for seven years, added his testimony to the remarkable record made by the service in the postwar period. Here is what he said:

During the Budget period prodigious economies have been made by the Postal Service. For instance, revenues at first and second class offices increased from \$404,000,000 in 1921 to \$632,000,000 in 1928, a rise of more than 55 per cent. The clerical man power to take care of this increase was increased less than 17 per cent.

Fifty-five per cent increase in business handled by a 17 per cent increase in personnel is a pretty good record, it seems to me, a record some of our big private institutions would be glad to make.

It must be remembered that this increase in production was due to human efficiency not automatic machinery. In other industries the increased use of power and mechanical aids is given as the main reasons for greater production. Inventive genius has not yet evolved any mechanical contrivance which will read the addresses on letters and postal cards, and the power which handles and distributes mail matter is still man power.

Yet if we consider all increases in compensation since 1913 and count in this reduction of working hours contemplated by this bill, the increased productivity of postal workers has paid for it all.

Quietly and with marvelous accuracy these workers have joined hands in the task of producing an all-inclusive service for every American. They have absorbed added costs without spectacular display but as a matter of course. In all justice they should have what they have so well earned. The laborer in the Postal Service is worthy of his hire and his fair share of the benefits of his increased production.

Shall we hesitate at estimates of cost? The only reason we do not now have an army of 750,000 postal employees is that every worker has doubled his output in the past 15 years. There are 371,000 postal workers in 1930 and the savings involved should be shared with those who did the work.

Nor should anyone hesitate to take this worthy action because of a so-called deficit. Congress has wisely acted in the past upon the fundamental policy that the Post Office Establishment is for service and not for profit. It has established new services which meant greater benefits to every American, but they did not pay for themselves. One act alone would wipe out the entire so-called deficit—the elimination of the Rural Free Delivery Service. It means the loss of more than \$50,000,000 a year. Yet not one Member of Congress would vote for such a destructive proposal. There are other losing services which could be eliminated, but no such action will be taken or should be taken.

Then let us not permit a so-called deficit in postal finances to bar postal workers from the possession of the shorter hours they have so faithfully earned.

Mr. Speaker, this measure has been before the Post Office Committee for a number of years. In the last Congress it was passed by the Senate and then favorably reported by the House committee. It was not voted upon in the House but remained on the calendar when the Seventieth Congress adjourned.

In this Congress the bill was favorably reported early in the last session. Among the determining factors in the action of the committee was one of the most comprehensive arguments for the 44-hour week that has ever been printed. It was the brief prepared under the direction of Thomas F. Flaherty, representing the National Federation of Post Office Clerks; William M. Collins, representing the National Railway Mail Association; and Edward Gainor, representing the National Association of Letter Carriers. Every possible objection was considered and carefully weighed. Finally, as a measure of justice, it was agreed that it should be enacted. The committee believes that there can be no valid objection to this measure.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. KELLY. Certainly.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Do I understand that this bill, in shortening the hours of work, will not mean any increased cost to the Government? I am sympathetic toward the measure, but I would like to ask the gentleman that question.

Mr. KELLY. It will certainly mean increased cost in the operation of the Postal Service.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Has there been any estimate made of that?

Mr. KELLY. I already mentioned that; but I will say that the Post Office Department estimated that by putting on additional workers to cover the four hours decrease the cost would be approximately \$13,000,000. The committee has controverted that estimate and has pointed to the fact that the Saturday half holiday is now given in about one-fourth of these offices without a cent's additional cost. I believe this worthy and progressive step can be taken without any necessity for expending more than \$6,000,000 and without the slightest curtailment of present service. Also every additional dollar goes to a worker who is now either unemployed or without sufficient employment to enable him to live on a proper standard.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNELL. As a matter of fact, are we not following the methods now employed by the great commercial industries of the country?

Mr. KELLY. Yes; we are getting in line with modern industrial progress and setting an example to nonprogressive industry as well.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY. Certainly.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. I am in favor of the gentleman's bill and I think it ought to pass, but will this mean additional employment or will it mean additional overtime for the men in the department who work on Saturdays?

Mr. KELLY. It will mean additional employment and not additional overtime.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. What happens to the man who is already in this employment and works on Saturday by request?

Mr. KELLY. By the terms of the bill he gets compensatory time off within the next five days wherever that is possible.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. He does not get any additional money?

Mr. KELLY. Not if the compensatory time is granted him; and, of course, that will be carried out wherever possible.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Is all this additional work to be done by new men or by additional employees?

Mr. KELLY. It will be performed by substitutes now on the eligible list, who are in most instances working only a few hours. This will benefit a great many of these apprentices of the Postal Service.

Mr. GIBSON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KELLY. Yes.

Mr. GIBSON. What are the hours of employment for the departmental employees here in Washington now?

Mr. KELLY. The work week for departmental employees in Washington now is 42 hours. Even under the terms of this bill postal employees in the field service will work 44 hours.

Mr. GIBSON. Is it not true that at certain periods four hours are taken off for holidays?

Mr. KELLY. Yes; during the summer season the Saturday half holiday reduces the working hours of departmental employees here in Washington.

Mr. IRWIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY. Yes; I yield.

Mr. IRWIN. This bill relates to the carriers in cities and villages, but not to the rural carriers?

Mr. KELLY. It can not be applied to rural carriers since they are not on an hourly basis.

Mr. HALE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY. Certainly.

Mr. HALE. I want to say that I am in favor of the bill, but I would like to ask the gentleman how many men will this measure give employment to—25,000?

Mr. KELLY. Yes; it will mean additional hours to that number of substitutes. If the cost is \$6,000,000, you can see that it will give additional work to a large number and every dollar goes to a worker.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SNELL. The Post Office Department will have a deficit of \$98,000,000, will it not?

Mr. KELLY. The postal deficit for 1930 is \$58,000,000.

Mr. SNELL. I thought there was a report that it was \$98,000,000.

Mr. KELLY. There is confusion because of the fact that there is segregated the amount of \$40,000,000, which is expended for various nonpostal and free services. The actual deficit is \$58,000,000.

Mr. SNELL. Has the gentleman taken into consideration where this money is to come from?

Mr. KELLY. If the gentleman will remain with us he will see how zealously the Post Office Committee has worked to increase postal revenues by the bills which follow this one. We have measures ready which will raise approximately the amount to cover this cost if we can secure their passage.

Mr. SNELL. Briefly, what are they?

Mr. KELLY. We have additional fees for receipt cards in registered mail matter; charges for inquiries as to C. O. D. registered mail and money orders; an additional charge for money orders paid at other than the office specified; a new service as to directory service and a charge therefor and others. These measures have the unanimous support of the Post Office Committee, and I hope the gentleman will help us enact them into law.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. KELLY. Certainly.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. The gentleman does not include the raise to 2½ cents on first-class mail?

Mr. KELLY. No; I do not, and I am confident that Congress will not adopt any such suggestion. [Applause.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have proved that the workers engaged in the vital industry of furnishing postal service to the people have earned a reduction in their working hours by their increased productivity. If nothing else were involved than rendering a just award to a group of workers who have faithfully earned it, there should be no hesitation in establishing the 44-hour work week in this great service.

However, there is another reason which is all compelling. Any government which is worthy of the name must be deeply interested in the solution of the most tragic problem of to-day—that of unemployment. The spectacle of three and a half million men, able and willing to work, but denied the opportunity, is one which challenges every official in public place.

Unemployment lies at the root of every social problem. Society demands labor and it imposes penalties for beggary and pauperism. Then there is responsibility for making every possible effort to make sure of a job for every man.

Judging from statements appearing in newspapers, magazines, and books, it is a case of writing your own ticket as to the causes of the present unemployment. I have tabulated some seventeen different reasons given by economists and near economists. Some are sound and some are fantastic.

One fact, however, is accepted by everyone who has thought about this question at all. You will hear it stated by every worker in the land as well as by the writers of books. It is that the displacement of men by machines has led to unemployment.

Of course, that is no new thing in itself, but never in the history of the world has the process been so rapid as in the

last 12 years. To-day it is a fundamental and permanent factor, and all the thoughtless optimism that in the long run it will work itself out is simply heartless disregard of human needs. Nor will such remedies as labor exchanges, unemployment insurance, stabilization, or confidence entirely meet the situation.

Increased production with decreased working force has reached the danger point. Shorter hours with no reduction in wages is a step which must be taken.

Think of the record. Between 1919 and 1925 the available per capita production in all industries in the United States increased 39 per cent. Between 1925 and 1929 it increased another 25 per cent.

At the same time the number of workers in factories was 1,250,000 less in 1928 than in 1923. Taking in farming, railroading, and mining, there were 2,300,000 fewer workers in 1928 than in 1923.

Production mounted side by side with employment decreasing. These are the factors which demand adjustment.

The results of such a situation face us in every city and hamlet. There is a vicious circle which affects every American. The workers who are dropped from the pay roll can not buy the products of their own and other factories. That means the dismissal of other men who join the ranks of those without purchasing power. The merchant can not sell goods and therefore can not buy from wholesaler and manufacturer. Round and round it goes, bringing increasing injuries with every revolution.

Mr. Chairman, we can produce much more than we now consume. Here is no question of famine as in the olden days—it is the problem of plenty. But it does not follow that we can produce more than Americans need and want. The trouble is that potential buyers do not have the money to purchase the products they really want and need.

Nothing will cause an effective demand for the products of American farms and factories, upon which employment depends, except money in the hands of the workers.

We know that we have the power to produce in this country all the necessities and comforts required to enable every American to maintain a reasonable scale of living. We are not doing it because so many do not have the purchasing power to secure those products.

The only way to restore that purchasing power is through jobs. And the way to make jobs for more men is to cut the working hours of those engaged in production to the point where consumption will balance production.

The great task is to start the upward spiral toward genuine prosperity. That is done by giving employment to workers who have been idle. That newly employed man spends his wages with retail dealers for the things he needs for himself and family. The dealers buy more goods from the wholesalers, who in turn buy more goods from manufacturers. They hire more workers to produce the goods. This means the purchase of more raw materials, which takes more labor to produce and more men and women to pack and ship. Freight-car loadings increase, which means more men on the railroads, more clerks to keep records. All these people with jobs have money to spend on food and clothes and other necessities and comforts. As they spend they increase the demand, giving employment to more and more workers.

Every additional worker required by shortening hours, under our present system of mass production, automatically becomes a force to start this upward spiral and keep it in motion.

Shorter working hours mean additional leisure, and this is an important factor in balancing production and consumption.

The committee on recent economic changes, which was headed by President Hoover, then Secretary of Commerce, made a valuable report covering many features of the present industrial system.

Walter F. Brown, now Postmaster General, was second man on this committee, and without doubt aided in the preparation of the report and agrees to its conclusions.

Here is one statement from that report which bears directly on this great question of shorter working hours in the Postal Service and in industry as a whole:

Closely related to the increased rate of production-consumption of products is the consumption of leisure.

It was during the period covered by the survey that the conception of leisure as "consumable" began to be realized upon in business in a practical way and on a broad scale. It began to be recognized not only that leisure is "consumable," but that people can not "consume" leisure without consuming goods and services, and that leisure which results from an increasing man-hour productivity helps to create new needs and new and broader markets.

During the period covered by the survey the trend toward increased leisure received a considerable impetus. The work week was shortened in the factory by better planning and modern machinery; and the work day was shortened in the home by the increased use of time and labor saving appliances and services.

Few of the current economic developments have made such widespread changes in our national life or promise so much for the future as the utilization of our increasing leisure.

Mr. Chairman, the work week in the Postal Service has not been shortened during the entire period of these recent economic changes. At the least, we should do what we can to help the development which "promises so much for the future."

Let us suppose that our action will be followed by all industry and governmental subdivisions.

There were, in 1927, 31,797,000 wage and salary earners in private industry. There were 2,819,000 public employees in Federal, State, and municipal governments. The total of all workers was 34,616,000.

In some industries working hours still remain much above the mark of 48 per week and in some industries they are lower than that figure. If we assume that all these workers are now employed 8 hours a day for six days a week, the change to the 44-hour week would reduce the working time by 8.35 per cent. If the working force were increased to make up for this reduction the increase in employment would be 2,608,000 in private industry and 235,000 in public employment, or a total of 2,843,000.

These additional employees would have new purchasing power demanding added production. The average yearly earnings for all salaried and wage workers in private industry in 1927 was \$1,379. At that same average the new employees would earn approximately \$3,000,000,000 a year. The average yearly earnings of all public employees in 1927 was \$1,585. At that same average the new workers would receive \$362,475,000, making a total increase for all new employees of \$3,362,475,000.

Of course, whatever number of new public employees were required, there would be no increase in production of goods to offset the new buying power. Their earnings would mean an equal reduction in the existing volume of so-called over-production. However, in the long run, judging from past experience, reduction in working hours would not decrease production.

But while the adjustment was being made there would be no great increase in production, and with a better adjustment of distribution generally the standard of living could be moved up to the level of increased efficiency. This would use up a part of the surplus which is now such a problem and point the way which should be taken to deal with it in the future.

Mr. Chairman, the old-time economists taught that the welfare of the worker could only be secured at the expense of the welfare of the employer or the consumer. That was not an economic law but an economic lie.

President Hoover has repeatedly asserted such a doctrine of despair. Let me quote his words:

During these past years we have grown greatly in the mutual understanding between employer and employee. We have seen a growing realization by the employer that the highest practicable wage is the road to increased consumption and prosperity, and we have seen a growing realization by labor that the maximum use of machines, of effort, and of skill is the road to lower production costs and in the end to higher real wages. (Address of acceptance, August 11, 1928.)

I wish to lay down the proposition that the very prerequisite, the very foundation, of economic progress to our industrial and business employees is full and stable employment. A continued

surplus of unemployed workers means decreasing wages, increasing hours, and fear for the future. To protect labor, to maintain its prosperity, to abolish poverty, we must so organize our economic system as to provide a job for all who have the will to work.

The new economic doctrine is urged by President William Green, of the American Federation of Labor. Here is what he says:

As the worker's productivity increases his wages first of all must increase in proportion in order that they shall help to absorb this increased output. Secondly, there must be a progressive reduction of the hours of labor, so that men and women may have time to rebuild exhausted physical energies. This is more than ever important in the highly specialized processes of modern industry, where speed and monotony tax physical resistance to the utmost. With these two safeguards the physical resistance of the workers can be conserved and the foundation laid for the higher development of spiritual and intellectual powers.

America has had repeated experience with industrial depressions to which wage reductions have contributed. We have been often confronted with the challenging situation of workers clamoring for work on one hand and on the other hand manufacturing establishments, equipped for work and with materials in supply, but no orders because there was no purchasing demand. In the face of this situation wage reductions seem to indicate lamentable intellectual inadequacy.

But in the past decade a different policy has been proving itself. America is now known as the land of high wages and industrial efficiency. It should also be known as the land of short hours, for short hours and efficiency go together wherever the right adjustment has been made.

Mr. Chairman, shorter hours are an economic necessity. There will be no permanent cure for unemployment until this step is taken. The army of unemployed will remain, even under the best of conditions, unless this step is taken by industry. And the sooner that step is taken the better it will be, not only for the unemployed but also for those leaders in industry who now have control of the great industrial system. Unless they earnestly attack this great problem of making better opportunities for working and living decently on the part of the common man in America, they must be branded as failures.

This Congress also has its responsibility. Here is a chance to set the example of shorter hours as applied to the workers in the biggest single enterprise in the world, the United States Postal Service. Refusal to act is proof of incompetence. Our action will prove that we do not propose to sit supinely by while the great mechanical system that has been built up works injury to men and women and little children. I believe this bill will be passed without a single dissenting vote.

Let us here and now establish the shorter work week in this industry in our charge. Then we may confidently expect private industry to follow in the path toward the goal every right-thinking American seeks, the time when there shall be a job for every man able and willing to work. [Applause.]

Mr. SANDERS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Hogg].

Mr. HOGG of Indiana. Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, the Personnel Classification Board reported to the Seventieth Congress (H. Doc. No. 602) that it had investigated the practices of 1,372 firms employing 446,623 workers, and found that—

There is a marked tendency to work short hours on Saturday throughout the entire year. Some offices close for the entire day in the summer months. Seventy-three per cent of the offices, employing 85 per cent of the total number of employees reporting, close at or before 1 o'clock Saturday afternoon. Only a little over 10 per cent of the employees received no time at all off on Saturday.

The American Management Association recently made a survey covering 304 establishments with a total of more than 174,000 office employees, and discovered that the working day on Saturday averaged slightly over four hours. Only 51 per cent of the offices worked longer hours in winter than in summer. Several reported closing all day Saturday in summer.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor has compiled the following facts showing the working hours of various kinds of union labor in the United States in 1928:

Average hours per week and per cent of trade-union members, by trade groups, working each classified number of hours per week, May 15, 1928

Trade group	Average hours per full-time week	Per cent of members whose hours per week were—									
		40 and under	Over 40 and under 44	44	Over 44 and under 48	48	Over 48 and under 54	54	Over 54 and under 60	60	Over 60
Bakers.....	47.4		12.3		3.8	80.0	0.8	3.1			
Building trades.....	43.5	15.3		82.3	1.1	.9	.3	.1			
Chauffeurs, teamsters, and drivers.....	54.8			1.4	4.3	14.6	11.3	20.5	14.0	31.8	2.1
Granite and stone trades.....	44.0	.1		99.6			.3				
Laundry workers.....	48.0					100.0					
Linemen.....	45.7	2.0		59.0	1.9	28.7	9.4	.7	.4		
Longshoremen.....	44.6			86.7		12.1			.9	.1	.1
Printing and publishing:											
Book and job.....	44.3	.1	.2	91.5		8.3					
Newspaper.....	45.1	5.7	11.6	9.8	41.4	31.4					
Total.....	44.9	10.6	.7	70.2	2.8	7.1	1.4	2.2	1.5	3.2	.2

As compared with the general population, post-office workers suffer from more impairments than the average in a number of respects. The United States Public Health Service determined this when they examined 985 postal employees a few years ago. The workers who volunteered for examination were actively employed and apparently in good health. Nevertheless the Public Health Service found the following physical defects per 1,000 men:

Defects	General population	Postal employees	Excess in post office
			Per cent
Heart disturbances.....	97	187	93
Rupture (hernia).....	51	80	57
Dilation of scrotal veins (varicocele).....	81	110	36
Flat feet.....	164	220	34
Hardening of the arteries.....	195	250	28

It has been more than 17 years—March 1, 1913—since Congress last adjusted the working hours of post-office clerks in first and second class offices and letter carriers in the City Delivery Service.

The productivity of these groups, measured in dollars and cents, has increased tremendously in the meantime. These figures tell the story.

The following statement by the Post Office Department shows the cost during the past eight years in producing \$1,000,000 of postal revenue:

1921.....	\$1,181,231
1922.....	1,148,831
1923.....	1,069,731
1924.....	1,039,899
1925.....	1,077,695
1926.....	1,051,276
1927.....	1,042,327
1928.....	1,048,099

To-day it costs \$133,000 less to produce a million dollars in revenue than it did in 1921. In other words, the increased cost in salaries has been more than absorbed by increased efficiency in the service.

Mr. W. R. Spilman, late superintendent of Post Office Service Division, before the Appropriations Committee considering the 1930 Post Office appropriation bill, said:

Let me call attention to the fact that in 1921 the man power per each \$1,000,000 of revenue was 165 men, working eight hours a day. The man power for \$1,000,000 of revenue has steadily decreased until 1927, when only 126 men of eight hours a day were employed. The same number were employed in 1928, when the revenues increased only 1.91 per cent over 1927. Further, the number of additional regular clerks employed in 1928 is only 1.62 per cent over the number employed in 1927, as compared with increases in 1928 of 2.99 per cent; in 1926, of 3.07 per cent; and in 1927, 2.44 per cent.

Eight years ago, on July 1, 1921, there were 66,789 employees in first and second class post offices, including clerks, supervisory employees, and laborers, but not letter carriers or motor-vehicle service employees. That was one employee for every \$6,050 of postal receipts. On the same date in 1928, seven years later, there were 78,133 employees, or one for every \$7,930 of postal receipts. In other words, in 1928 each employee, through greater industry and in-

creased efficiency—and there can be no other explanation of it—was turning out 31 per cent more work than in 1921.

During the Budget period prodigious economies have been effected by the Postal Service. For instance, revenues at first and second class post offices increased from \$404,000,000 in 1921 to \$632,000,000 in 1928, a rise of more than 55 per cent. That meant an increase of 55 per cent in work, too. The clerical man power to take care of this increase rose from 66,789 in 1921 to 77,901 in 1928, an increase of less than 17 per cent.

Fifty-five per cent increase in business handled by a 17 per cent increase in personnel is a pretty good record, it seems to me; a record some of our big private institutions would be glad to make.

The Post Office Department has gone as far as it can go without legislation to give the employees shorter hours per week. The employees in some offices are given the benefit of the order of the department, while those of another office are unable to enjoy those benefits. This bill provides for the equal treatment of all postal employees, while at the same time providing against any curtailment of service.

Some of the largest business enterprises in the country have carried out the purpose of this measure and it has been found to be beneficiary from a production standpoint. The employees of the Post Office Department in the executive offices in Washington now have a basic 42-hour week. Even with the enactment of the 44-hour-week bill the postal employees in the field service will be working longer hours than the postal employees at the executive offices.

The average hours of work at a building trade throughout the Nation is 43.7. The present measure provides that whenever the needs of the office require the employment of postal employees on Sunday afternoons they shall be given compensatory time on one of the five working days following.

It is the purpose of this measure that postal employees shall be given four hours off on Saturday where no injury will be done to service, but in case such curtailment would have a detrimental effect upon the service, then the work shall be performed on Saturday and a compensatory four hours be allowed on one of the following five days.

In the report of the Hon. Walter F. Brown, Postmaster General, for the fiscal year ended July 30, 1930, there is the following statement of items in the postal deficit which are not, in fact, postal charges. That report is as follows:

	Revenue equivalent	Expense
Distributable loss.....		\$98,448,782.80
Penalty matter for branches of the Government other than the Post Office Department, including free registration.....	\$9,347,505.00	
Franked matter for:		
1. Members of Congress.....	718,060.00	
2. Others than Members of Congress.....	154,545.00	
Total franked matter.....	872,605.00	
Publications going free in country.....	753,263.00	
Free mail for the blind.....	63,779.00	
Differentials in second-class postage favoring religious, educational, scientific, philanthropic, agricultural, labor, and fraternal organizations.....	414,388.00	

Excess cost of airplane service over the postage revenues derived from air mail.....	Revenue equivalent	Expense
Differentials favoring vessels of American registry.....		\$13,863,174.10
Nonproductive and extraordinary items.....	\$11,451,540.00	28,218,178.39
Net operating deficit, exclusive of nonproductive and extraordinary items.....		\$39,669,718.39
		58,779,064.41

The rural mail free delivery should be extended as rapidly as possible, but it occasions a loss of more than \$50,000,000 each year.

On June 30, 1930, there were 43,278 rural routes in operation, supplying 6,875,321 families, or 25,471,735 individuals. It is indeed a most necessary service, but I am not so sure that it is fair to stress it as a postal deficit. Rather, it is payment for an urgent agriculture service.

In all walks of life better organized effort brings bigger and more satisfactory results. No employer would to-day permit the employee to work as long hours as the employee was required to work 25 years ago. Such hours would not be permitted because the employee can do more and better work in shorter hours and in many instances because of a real humanitarian motive. The 12-hour day with the oil lamps and dirt roads has given place to the 44-hour week with more effective work and a greater enjoyment of life.

Efficient work is the order of the day in America. Unless a man works he does not command the respect of his fellows. Those who do not work have different names in the various countries of the Old World, but here they are generally known as tramps. Therefore, with the desire to work so characteristic and universal in America, shorter work hours naturally follow.

Many able leaders think that America shall have a 5-day work week. There are many unanswerable arguments for it. The only permanent thing in the world is change.

By the enactment of this bill Congress will give the dignity and benefit of legislation to a great economic humanitarian forward movement. The Postal Department is the largest and most efficient organization in the world. Gen. Walter F. Brown and his exceedingly able assistants are entitled to the gratitude of the Nation. For the benefits of this legislation has come the patient and unanswerable proofs by representation of the postal employees' associations.

The facts and brief submitted to our committee by Mr. Thomas F. Flaherty, of the National Federation of Post-office Clerks, which brief covers 16 pages of the report of the hearings of the committee, is a most comprehensive statement. It is worth the careful study of anyone interested in the progress of better working and health conditions. The brief represents a vast amount of thought and shows that the cost of the change, which would not be great in any case, could be largely neutralized by further gains in efficiency and decreases in absenteeism, which has been proved to follow reductions in hours in many other instances.

The National Association of Letter Carriers, by its president, Mr. Edward Gainor, and Mr. M. T. Finnan, its secretary, presented to the committee reasons that can not be answered why the 60,000 carriers which they represent would be helped by this legislation with little or no additional cost to the department. Their brief is exhaustive and the information contained is most pertinent. Excerpts are printed in this report of the committee.

There also appeared before the committee representatives of the other organizations of employees who do the actual work of handling the mails.

Mr. Chairman, it was never intended that the Post Office Department should be a profit-making institution. It was created for service and not for profit. This legislation will not in any event cost a large amount. It will be worth many times its cost, not alone in more effective service which can be measured in terms of dollars but in better health and a fuller enjoyment of life. [Applause.]

Mr. SANDERS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, no time is more opportune for the passage of this measure than the present. I

hope that before the holidays this measure will have been passed by the Senate so that it can become a law and be a Christmas present to this large army of deserving employees. I defend my position in favor of shortening the hours not alone upon the ground of its humanitarian principle, but also upon the ground that no measure can do more to meet the conditions of unemployment than this measure for the Postal Service. Here is a real remedy for unemployment. By shortening the hours it will provide additional help for the substitutes, and there is a large number of substitutes in the respective services of the Postal Department who have been employed for only fractional-time service.

I wish also to direct attention to a companion bill (S. 471), which provides like consideration to the large army of department clerks throughout the country, both in Washington and in the field. That bill was on the Unanimous Consent Calendar of the House and was objected to and removed from consideration under Unanimous Consent Calendar rule. This is a Senate bill. All that is required now, as we are going to pass this Postal Service bill virtually unanimously, is that before the holidays we shall pass the companion bill granting a Saturday half-holiday privilege to the vast army of employees in the departments, both here in Washington and in the field.

May I say now that I remember as a boy 45 years ago the policy adopted by that far-seeing merchant, John Wanamaker, of Philadelphia, when he established for the first time, I believe, in the commercial world the policy of closing his store at noon on Saturdays. That policy has spread until it is almost nation-wide.

Certainly in Philadelphia all of the large department stores throughout the year close on Saturday afternoon. Then, again, may I refer to that leader of industry, Henry Ford, who not only established a high rate of wages for the men he employed but shortened the days of employment to five days a week. One of the great problems besetting industry to-day and the entire American employing class is to find work for the employees which has been taken up by the production of labor-saving devices. Years back we adopted the 8-hour law. We are coming to the policy of shortening that schedule of hours.

So, to be consistent in our policy, not only do I expect this bill to be passed and to become a law before the holidays as a present to the postal employees, but I hope likewise the companion bill to which I referred will have become a law and will become a Christmas present to the large army of departmental workers in the Government.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. I wonder if the gentleman is familiar with the fact that Mr. Wanamaker opened his store with prayer, and that they have an organ recital in the morning. Also, that John Wanamaker was the head of the largest Sunday school in Philadelphia.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am well acquainted with his being the head of the Bethany Sunday School in Philadelphia for nearly 50 years, and I have heard the wonderful organ recitals in his store in Philadelphia. I was not advised that he had opened his store with prayer, as we open our meetings here; but if that was the policy originated by him, it is a commendable one, so far as his institution is concerned.

Mr. O'CONNELL. We followed the very same course this morning before taking up this humanitarian measure, by starting our session with prayer. We are on an equality with Mr. Wanamaker there.

Mr. STAFFORD. I hope the gentleman is not citing that in disparagement of the memory of that great merchant prince, John Wanamaker.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Chairman, I take it that everybody present is in favor of this bill. I presume the only opposition is from Members of the House and Senate who believe we are not going far enough, those who favor the 5-day

week for all employees of the Government. I rise merely to explain the history of this bill and my reasons for supporting it. I would gladly vote for a better bill if such a measure was before us for consideration.

I had the honor to introduce the first 44-hour bill for postal employees in Congress. This fight for a shorter working week was started in the Seventieth Congress. A companion bill to mine was introduced in the Senate by Senator LA FOLLETTE, of Wisconsin.

Hearings were held on the La Follette bill by the Senate Post Office Committee on April 19, 1928. Hearings were held before the subcommittee of the House Post Office Committee on the Mead bill on May 10, 1928.

The Senate passed the La Follette bill on May 11, 1928. Opposition to the measure was voiced by Postmaster General New. Finally, on February 8, 1929, the La Follette bill, as passed by the Senate, was reported favorably to the House. The La Follette bill was reached in the House on the unanimous consent calendar on February 25, 1929. Its passage was objected to and it failed to reach a vote, despite an overwhelming favorable House sentiment.

In the present Congress practically the same measure has been introduced in the House by my colleague, Representative KENDALL, of Pennsylvania. It is before us now to consider and I earnestly urge its speedy enactment. Although the Post Office Department has by permissive order reduced work on Saturday afternoons the fact remains that thousands of postal employees are still working on a 48-hour weekly schedule. There are compelling reasons for a reduction in these schedules to 44 hours.

It has been 17 years since the Congress by legislation readjusted the working hours of the postal clerks and city letter carriers in first and second class offices. During this time the productivity of these workers has increased more than 100 per cent. In his speech to the American Federation of Labor convention in Boston on October 6 President Hoover said:

Both the directors of industry and your leaders have made great progress toward a new and common ground in economic conceptions, which, I am confident, has had a profound effect upon our economic progress during the last few years. That is the conception that industry must be constantly renovated by scientific research and invention; that labor welcomes these labor-saving devices; that labor give its full and unrestricted effort to reduce costs by the use of these machines and methods; that the savings from these reduced costs shall be shared between labor, employer, and the consumer. It is a philosophy of mutual interest. It is a practice of cooperation for an advantage that is not only mutual but universal. Labor gains either through increase of wage or reduction of cost of living or shortened hours.

Putting into practical application the ideas of President Hoover, the postal workers are clearly entitled to shorter hours, having reduced greatly the labor costs in the Postal Service.

GREATER PRODUCTIVITY

The following statement shows the cost during the past eight years in producing \$1,000,000 of postal revenues:

1921.....	\$1,181,231
1922.....	1,148,831
1923.....	1,069,731
1924.....	1,039,899
1925.....	1,077,695
1926.....	1,051,276
1927.....	1,042,327
1928.....	1,048,099

From these figures furnished by the Post Office Department there has been a substantial reduction in the cost of producing revenues. To-day it costs \$133,000 less to produce a million dollars in revenue than it did in 1921. In other words, the increased cost in salaries has been more than absorbed by increased efficiency in the service.

The following statement was made by the representative of the department, the late W. R. Spilman, superintendent of Post Office Service Division, before the Appropriations Committee considering the 1930 Post Office appropriation bill:

Let me call attention to the fact that in 1921 the man power per each \$1,000,000 of revenue was 165 men, working eight hours a day. The man power for \$1,000,000 of revenue has steadily decreased until 1927, when only 126 men of eight hours a day were

employed. The same number were employed in 1928, when the revenues increased only 1.91 per cent over 1927. Further, the number of additional regular clerks employed in 1928 is only 1.62 per cent over the number employed in 1927, as compared with increases in 1925 of 2.99 per cent, in 1926, 3.07 per cent, and in 1927, 2.44 per cent.

VIEWS OF THE DIRECTOR OF THE BUDGET, H. M. LORD

General Lord, known as a watchdog of the Treasury, made this complimentary reference to the economies in the Postal Service:

During the Budget period prodigious economies have been effected by the Postal Service. For instance, revenues at first and second class post offices increased from \$404,000,000 in 1921 to \$632,000,000 in 1928, a rise of more than 55 per cent. That meant an increase of 55 per cent in work, too. The clerical man power to take care of this increase rose from 66,789 in 1921 to 77,901 in 1928, an increase of less than 17 per cent.

Fifty-five per cent increase in business handled by a 17 per cent increase in personnel is a pretty good record, it seems to me, a record some of our big private institutions would be glad to make.

BARTLETT FAVORS LEGISLATION

In a notable speech at the New Orleans convention of the American Federation of Labor on November 26, 1928, former First Assistant Postmaster General John H. Bartlett indorsed the 44-hour bill, saying:

It has been my purpose to be as considerate of the men in their aspirations to better conditions as I possibly could. We have done something in the way of giving them the Saturday afternoon. Perhaps we have gone as far as we can without legislation, but personally—not speaking here for the Government, because I can not do that—but personally, I am heartily in favor of all men in the Postal Service having Saturday afternoon or its equivalent; in other words, the 44-hour week. [Prolonged applause.]

LEGISLATION URGED BY NATIONAL FEDERATION OF POST-OFFICE CLERKS

At its last national convention held in New York City, September, 1929, the National Federation of Post Office Clerks, with a membership of 50,000 clerks in first and second class offices, made the 44-hour legislation its paramount objective. In his report to the convention Secretary Thomas F. Flaherty said:

It is not necessary to argue in this report as to the economic soundness of the proposed postal 44-hour week. The industrial trend is rapidly in the direction of shorter working hours. Instances of this could be quoted at great length. The vanguard of the working army, in fact, has already reached the 5-day-week objective—one that we, too, will approach by successive steps. Post Office Department employees in Washington, whose salaries are paid from postal revenues, have a 7-hour day with Saturday half-holidays in the summer months. In the face of these facts, together with the gradual increase in productivity—a larger output per employee—on the part of the postal workers, there is no justification for further executive opposition to this economically sound proposition.

In recognition of the importance and value of this legislation it is recommended the legislative representative be instructed to center attention upon the speedy enactment of the La Follette-Mead bill as our paramount legislative objective.

[Editorial from the Union Postal Clerk for November, 1930]

HOOVER VERSUS BROWN

Very unfortunately for the postal employee there is a wide divergence in the economic views of President Hoover and Postmaster General Brown.

Said the President to the American Federation of Labor Convention, speaking of greater production of labor:

"That the savings from these reduced costs shall be shared between labor, employer, and the consumer. It is a philosophy of mutual interest. It is a practice of cooperation for an advantage that is not only mutual but universal. Labor gains either through increase of wage or reduction of cost of living or shortened hours."

In sharp contrast to the above view, in which we concur without reservation, is the opinion of the Postmaster General as expressed to the House Post Office Committee at a hearing on the 44-hour bill on February 12, 1930:

"In industrial employment the law of supply and demand, in a considerable measure, regulates compensation. If there is a long cue of applicants for work outside of the employment office, the institution does not raise wages. It raises wages to get competent, skilled workmen. The Post Office Department has a long cue waiting. We would have little, if any, difficulty in filling most of the places we have very promptly if they should be vacated."

The Postmaster General made no mention of the right of postal employees to a share in their increased earnings—in the form of reduced hours. He ignored entirely the fact there has been no substantial adjustment of working hours for the larger groups of postal employees for 17 years, during which period their productivity, measured in dollars and cents, has increased 100 per

cent. He seemingly clings to the archaic view that labor is a commodity to be purchased as cheaply as possible and when it is plentiful, as at present, there is no need to improve employment conditions. Hence his opposition to the 44-hour bill. Furthermore, Mr. Brown pointedly implies, if you don't like it you can quit the job.

What we need is some law requiring a Postmaster General to make practical application of his President's economic views, even though they may differ from his own.

This country is in a serious and critical condition at this hour. We are going through hard times the like of which our country has never been forced to endure in the past. The winter ahead of us will certainly be known as the winter of want, trial, and tribulation. Surely an emergency exists in America to-day, and this Congress and this administration, in keeping with statements officially made in the past, should devote every moment possible to the consideration of this serious problem and to the expeditious passage of legislation such as contained in this particular bill which we are now considering. In no better way can we contribute to a return of prosperity than by increasing employment. The most effective way in which we can bring that about is by reducing the hours of service of those who are employed, in order that those without work might enjoy employment in the near future. [Applause.]

Mr. O'CONNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEAD. Yes; I yield to my colleague.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Might not the adoption of this legislation open up an avenue to some of the substitutes that are hanging around the post offices of the country and an opportunity to get some kind of work?

Mr. MEAD. It certainly will. In view of the drastic curtailment of service and the reduction of the personnel resulting from the policy of the present postal administration, substitutes are almost entirely without work or hope of work at the present time.

I intend to discuss this matter at greater length later on, for I believe every Member of Congress is vitally concerned in maintaining the highest standard of service in this department and in according the employees working conditions that will give them some hope of future advancement.

The gentleman [Mr. O'CONNELL] is familiar with that situation, and it is very serious. As a matter of fact, my information is that it is almost impossible, under the present ruling of the Postmaster General, for a substitute to receive a regular appointment for four or five years to come.

Mr. HASTINGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield gladly.

Mr. HASTINGS. I wish to congratulate the gentleman on the splendid address he has made, but I do not think we should apologize for this legislation. I am supporting it because I believe it is economically sound. I am not supporting it as a temporary measure. This is not temporary legislation. I do not think we should hide behind the unemployment situation as an argument in favor of this bill. I think we should argue that it is economically sound, that it is not a temporary measure, but that it is permanent legislation, and I think that the gentleman in his splendid address has thoroughly justified the economic soundness of this legislation.

Mr. MEAD. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HASTINGS] and I agree with him thoroughly. My only apology for the bill is that it does not go far enough.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SANDERS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGUARDIA].

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, it is rather restful to be able to say that I agree with the committee, and I am going to vote for the bill.

However, I do not place my support of this bill on the ground of sentimentality or on the yuletide spirit. It is simply an economic necessity, and something which Congress should have done several months ago.

We are approaching the time when we must face the problems that are confronting the country, and this is the first effective, constructive attempt to meet this unemployment crisis, which is not temporary but which will be permanent

until we adjust ourselves to the changed conditions under which we are living.

I look on this bill as the Government's approval of a system of shortening the hours of labor preliminary to shortening the working week. That is the only method by which you can extend to all the people of the country the enjoyment and benefit of the improved methods of production and the progress in science and mechanics.

You can not talk about labor-saving devices and you can not talk about overproduction unless you stop to consider the necessity of a readjustment of the relations between labor and capital. An entire new deal—new conditions of labor—is necessary.

Now that Congress provides the 44-hour week, it is up to the Post Office Department to adjust itself by giving more work to substitutes. I have taken this matter up with the Postmaster General, and I am glad to say that the Postmaster General has stated to me and has written to me that he would approve of a bill or a law which would guarantee a certain amount of annual pay to a substitute who is awaiting permanent appointment.

I submit that to the committee, and I am going to hand the letter of the Postmaster General to my good friend from Pennsylvania, Mr. KELLY, who is persona gratissimo and spokesman extraordinary for the department and for his party. It will then come before your committee under the most auspicious circumstances.

Mr. Chairman, as I said before, I am sorry that this bill was not passed months ago. It is the first small step in the right direction. [Applause.]

Mr. SANDERS of New York. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW].

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I believe this bill, which seeks to establish by law a 44-hour week for postal employees, is a just and humane measure and because I so believe I am giving to it my unstinted support. I want to be frank in telling why I am for this bill. I am for it not only because of its merit per se, but even more because of the example it affords of governmental sanction of the shorter week of labor. I am for it because I believe it sets the pace for a better social order. "Live and let live" is an axiom that reflects the highest conception of Christian philanthropy. It measures the broadest reaches of catholicity in human relations. Interpreted in every-day terms it means that those who have wealth and leisure and amusements should be willing to concede to those who are less fortunately circumstanced their right to furloughs from the grind, their hours for rest and recreation, their opportunities to cultivate the uplifting things of the spirit. "Live and let live" is a good foundation on which to build the legislation of a commonwealth.

I do not believe the Congress can possibly go wrong if it passes this measure. It is an echo of what is going on in the business world. It is in complete harmony with the best thought of the master minds whose marvelous vision is solving the industrial problems of the twentieth century. Thomas A. Edison, whose genius has done so much to unlock the secrets of the universe, has declared that "The hours of labor should be reduced to not more than eight per day and not more than five days a week." Henry Ford finds the 5-day week a profitable innovation. Among leaders of industry there is a growing recognition that the shortened week justifies itself in the happiness it brings and the morale it creates, as well as in sustained if not actually increased productivity. The bill before us is not as far reaching as the ideal of Ford and Edison and others whose vision is charting the future course of industry. As against their 5-day standard for industrialists it proposes a five and a half day week for postal workers. When we compare the bill before us with the views of such conservative and far-seeing men it can hardly be charged that this is reckless legislation. Under this bill there will be no crippling of the indispensable activities of the Postal Service. The proponents of the measure realize that the Postal Service is a continuing service and under this legislation it will function in a reduced way but for all necessary purposes on

Saturday afternoons, and employees who are thus deprived of their Saturday afternoons will be given compensatory time off other days of the week.

It is argued that this bill, if it passes, will increase the postal deficit. It seems to me that point has been greatly magnified by the opponents of the bill. I believe that a worker who is refreshed and invigorated by rest and recreation will turn out more work per hour while he toils than one who is not so refreshed and invigorated, and that on account of increased productivity part of the anticipated deficit will never materialize. In many post offices the employees of certain grades already enjoy short Saturday working hours through administrative action of the postmasters. Of course, it will be necessary to employ some additional workers, or give more work to substitutes, but that will not be without its compensations in these days when public policy dictates that as many jobs as possible be found to relieve the widespread unemployment.

But suppose this legislation does result in a slight increase of the postal deficit. What of it? There is really no reason to be horrified because the annual statement of the Post Office Department is written in red ink. The postal system is our greatest public utility. It is not a money-making institution. It is a public service. So long as it is administered honestly, economically, and efficiently the people of this country will never complain. They appreciate the service; they approve its expansion; they want to enjoy its maximum benefits; and they do not demand that it be taken "out of the red." Perhaps this bill will add a few million dollars per annum to the national expense, but it will be money well invested.

This is a worth-while measure. It is a logical part of the historic movement toward the shorter working week. Its passage means a happy and contented personnel in the Postal Service. Only this year the Congress of the United States appropriated \$1,500,000 to buy some old books for the Library of Congress. As a member of the Committee on the Library I did not object to reporting this legislation, although I was not exactly gleeful over it. I believe in those things which make for culture and education, but I submit that Congress, having spent \$1,500,000 for a collection of old books to be kept in Washington, should not object to spending some millions for a purpose so splendid, so humane, so conducive to an improvement of social relations, so beneficial to thousands of our fellow beings as the purpose which underlies the Kendall 44-hour week bill, on which we shall soon pass our judgment. [Applause.]

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZPATRICK].

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am in favor of the bill now before the House. The splendid work of our postal employees, which has raised the service to its present high efficiency, entitled them to the 44-hour week. In all kinds of weather these loyal public servants pursue their daily tasks. They are the arteries of our social and business life. Any breakdown would cripple our business and leave us impotent and dismayed. The Members of the House appreciate this devotion to duty, and that is why we are eager to vote this legislation, anxious to grant this boon to the men and women of our postal system. I shall always look back with satisfaction to the small part I was permitted to play in making the half-holiday bill the law of the land. Last week I introduced a 40-hour bill for all Federal employees, and, as I stated at the time, I believe that less hours and shorter weeks is the only solution of the present unemployment situation. It has been stated by a number of prominent public officials and business men throughout the country that they believe that less hours is the only solution. Just before election there was a statement published in the New York newspapers, alleged to have been made by President Hoover, in which he stated that the invention of machinery and our mass production were greatly responsible for the present unemployment situation in our country. Now, if that be true, the only solution is less hours and shorter weeks. The distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee only last week drew a

beautiful picture of what President Hoover did a year ago when he called the men representing capital and labor to Washington and asked them to help out on the unemployment situation. The representatives of capital and labor promised the President to do everything to help improve the unemployment conditions in our country. Now, what really happened? The president of the New York Edison Co. returned to New York and discharged a large number of employees. The presidents of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad, the Railway Express Co., the New Jersey Central Railroad, and Henry Ford did the very same thing. Did President Hoover send for those men and ask them why they had broken their promise or pledge to him? He did not. He could not well have called them back, because the very thing he would again ask them to do the Government was failing to do itself; on the contrary, the Federal Government deprived men of employment in the navy yards, issued an order in the Postal Service whereby they reduced deliveries of mail, that meant doing away with the services of a number of employees, and at the same time have refused to fill these vacancies that exist in the post office.

To-day throughout the United States there are over 5,000 vacancies, and in the city of New York over 600. So you can readily see, Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the House, that the President should not ask private capital to do what the Federal Government has failed to do. The President at the time he called this conference asking the business men not to reduce wages of their employees at the same time asked the representatives of labor not to look for increases and cause any disturbance. The representatives of our working classes carried out their promise, but what has the Federal Government done toward paying the prevailing rate of wages. In the Labor Committee, of which I am a member, we reported out a bill at the last session of Congress which provided that the Federal Government on all its public works should pay the prevailing rate of wages. That bill has been held in the Rules Committee; it never came before the House, and to-day throughout the United States there are buildings being constructed by contractors who are using cheap labor where those buildings are being constructed and are not paying the prevailing rate of wages. Was the President sincere when he asked private capital to keep up wages and stimulate employment? When the Federal Government failed to authorize the prevailing rate of wages, and also failed, as I have pointed out, to keep the men employed in the navy yards and Postal Service. What Congress should do is pass a 40-hour week bill, and the message would be sent across the country that Congress has at last taken action, and if the States will follow in our footsteps it will be only a few months when the large unemployment personnel will be helped. The working people of our country are not looking for charity; they would spurn it; they are not looking for a dole; they want justice and employment. We can bring this about by enacting the proper laws to make less hours and shorter weeks for Federal employees, and if that is followed by the States we will be able to compete with the machinery and mass production throughout the country. We are suffering from mass production and the invention of great machinery. You have appropriated millions of dollars only on yesterday for roadways. This will bring only temporary relief to certain sections of our country. If you would have permanent relief, then let us have less hours and shorter weeks. I am not concerned with who gets the credit for it or how the country votes in 1932, what I want is something to relieve this unemployment situation and bring prosperity back to our country. [Applause.]

Mr. MEAD. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNELL].

Mr. O'CONNELL. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the committee, it is very gratifying, after all of these years, to find the House at last in a position to vote on this very meritorious legislation.

In the last hours of the recent session we were about to pass this bill, and the postmen of the country would have

been enjoying the privilege of what the law would have allowed during these several months during the recess of the Congress.

I said then, and I repeat now, that it is very unfortunate that legislation of this kind, which practically has the unanimous sentiment of the Congress, has been prevented being enacted because of certain rules which the House has adopted, which permit one or two men to prevent the enactment of legislation. I am particularly happy, on the eve of the passage of this bill, because, as my colleague from New York [Mr. LaGUARDIA] said a few moments ago, it opens the avenue to every branch of governmental service. It will give an opportunity to those men and women who man the services of the United States to enjoy the privilege of this half-holiday legislation.

In the early part of 1927 I had the pleasure of introducing a similar bill to the one now under consideration; in fact, the very first bill. Perhaps it was given to better hands and to greater minds, such as the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KENDALL], who now brings the child forth in its effulgent glory in the evening of a long-distinguished and useful life.

If this 44-hour-week program is adopted, would it not be possible to give consideration to the applications of many more men whose services we could employ in the post office, following the suggestion of the President of the United States, as he made it to the commercial representatives of the great industries at a recent conference here in Washington? "More work, better pay; constant work."

Now, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, in giving consideration to employment standards the two factors of major moment are wages and hours of labor. The effect of those two items on the worker's life and well-being is so profound and far-reaching as to defy overstatement. Moreover, there exists an intimate and apparently interdependent relationship between wage rates and hours of labor. Long hours and low wages go hand in hand. Strangely, too, and as an historical review will fully disclose, advancing wages and declining hours of toil have kept step together. Forecasting the future, the prediction can be safely made that, as the hours of labor go downward, the course of real wages will be upward.

My purpose is to give consideration to the continuing trend toward a shorter work week throughout industry, with particular regard to the institution and observance of a shorter work day on Saturday in post offices. Almost eight years have elapsed since former Postmaster General Work, on July 13, 1922, issued the original order concerning the observance of a shorter work day on Saturday in post offices, which, in a restricted way, gave this innovation its initial trial. This trial proved a complete success; so complete, in fact, that on December 1, 1922, former Postmaster General Work issued an order supplementing and confirming the original order, and making its terms applicable throughout the year. Later, on May 4, 1924, and again on September 3, 1924, former Postmaster General New issued orders which in substance invested postmasters with discretionary authority to limit work on Saturday afternoons during all the months of the year in keeping with imperative service requirements.

Behind the shorter work day on Saturday are now eight years of invaluable experience. Introduced in a limited way and largely as an experiment, it has made remarkable progress both in scope and observance. Under varying auspices and for varying periods of time city letter carriers and other postal employees have been granted respite from duty on Saturday afternoons, while service efficiency has been maintained at a high level.

The progress thus made is highly encouraging. The future is bright with promise. It is plain, however, that the time has arrived when serious consideration should be given to a further expansion and liberalization of this observance, so as to assist the Postal Service to keep step with social and economic progress on the one hand and permit a more general participation in its benefits on the other.

The shorter workday on Saturday in post offices is no longer on trial. Seven years' experience has confirmed, and

abundantly confirmed, its practicability and usefulness. It has proven itself on every count. Its initial trial occurred at a timely hour. Throughout business and industry Saturday half-holiday observance, long established, has developed to a point where it is well-nigh universal. The trend of progress now tends steadily toward the 5-day work week. Public opinion with unmistakable voice has registered its approval of the shorter workday on Saturday in post offices. Through broad-scale cooperation this observance during the past six years has served to stimulate service efficiency and enthusiasm, and the innovation has resulted well in every item and particular. Prompt deliveries on the succeeding Monday morning have been the invariable rule, and service morale and employees' health and well-being have been greatly enhanced thereby with little, if any, added cost. Every service requirement has been fully answered. Moreover, the Saturday half-holiday idea is fundamentally and economically sound. Wisdom insistently counsels its wider acceptance.

There is no special virtue in any certain number of labor hours per day. Time was when 10 and 12 hours or more was the daily average. The advent of the 8-hour workday, the adoption of which was long and bitterly resisted, marked another notable social advance. Now the 8-hour day no longer satisfies. Progress has passed that point. More than one-half the organized crafts now observe a 44-hour schedule, or less, per week, with the number of workers thus affected growing steadily.

Primarily this progress has been achieved because society could afford it. In the crude-tool days much of the workers' waking hours were devoted to providing for the essential needs of food, clothing, and shelter. Then one new tool succeeded another until there is now no longer a problem of production. A problem of plenty now confronts us, a problem in many ways as perplexing as that of scarcity. To maintain a proper balance between production and consumption and to keep these forces healthy and active, and thus sustain and diffuse the blessings of national prosperity, compels the progressive adoption of the shorter work week.

I want to commend the chairman of the committee [Mr. SANDERS]. I want to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY]. I desire to commend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPROUL] of the committee, and my colleague from New York [Mr. MEAD] for the splendid work they have done in bringing this bill to its present state of fruition.

It is gratifying for me to say as a Member of Congress that the representatives of the postal clerks and carriers of the United States Postal Service and the personnel of their executive officers in Washington must be very much pleased as we approach the end of this debate. They are always bound to receive consideration because of the manner in which they approach Members of Congress and because of the splendid and efficient way in which they present their causes. I must commend in the highest terms the loyalty of C. P. FRANCISCUS, the energetic president of the United Association of Post Office Clerks in Washington, who interested me in the original 44-hour bill which I am sure the House is about to pass. Then, too, I offer my congratulations to Thomas H. Flaherty, secretary of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks, for his constructive suggestions to the Post Office Committee in the formation of this very salutary legislation. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to my colleague [Mr. OLIVER of New York].

Mr. OLIVER of New York. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am happy to have been here to-day and listened to Congressman FITZPATRICK make his first speech on the floor. I can account for the earnestness with which he spoke because of his own life. Here was a man who was a miner when a boy, and now he makes his first speech for reasonable living conditions for those who labor. No wonder his whole soul was in what he said. Perhaps his life and his rise can be taken as the measurement of the rise of labor. He has seen the time when a laborer was a

slave, where time off did not amount to anything but just an opportunity to recover from exhaustion. Now he stands in the Congress of the United States pleading for reasonable hours for those who labor. I can understand the fierce pride with which he spoke. I can understand the wrath in his voice when he made a demand that this bill pass, because what he said is but an echo of the things in which he has lived and which he believes. So to-day I congratulate my colleague from the Bronx, my neighbor and my old-time friend, for having made his first utterance in the Congress in behalf of a cause for which he has lived and which he so devoutly loves.

Of course, I am for this bill. I am for it, whether there be unemployment in the country or not. I am for it just to give the postmen a square deal. Here we have the most popular service in America, but somehow or other we forget that the postmen and the postal employees could not go anywhere on Saturday afternoon except to work; we forgot they had families; we forgot they needed recreation; we had subordinated the welfare of the postmen to the welfare of the mail. We had to rush the delivery of a lot of magazines, a lot of letters, which are thrown into the waste basket, and we forgot all about the man who was compelled to do that under the compulsion of law. I am for the postmen because the postmen have been loyal to their service. They have never neglected anything, and if there is a service which has a spirit of 100 per cent loyalty to the tasks that have been imposed upon it it has been the Postal Service. I am for the postman's wife. I think that if a postman's wife can run a family on the little amount that is given to the postman she ought to be President of the United States. I am sure she could cut down deficits and run this Government in an economical manner and have a surplus left over.

But I can not understand the attitude of the Postmaster General. He is opposed to this bill. Who is this great statesman out of sympathy and out of harmony with all the trend of the times? In his own department, as Congressman FITZPATRICK pointed out, he has 5,000 vacancies at this very moment. Why does he not fill those jobs? If I were he, I would step out of my office at this dreadful hour in the history of our country if I were to leave those jobs unfilled for 24 hours more. We have Col. Arthur Woods calling up governors and calling up mayors asking them to please give men jobs. I will tell Arthur Woods, my old-time friend, that if he wants 5,000 jobs, let him go into the Postmaster General's office and bang his fist on his desk and say, "Mr. Postmaster General, the President has appointed me head of an emergency committee on unemployment and I demand that you fill these jobs or resign your own job." In the city of New York every human agency is giving charity to the unemployed. Everywhere in the country the movement is going on splendidly. We condemn doles, but this is lower than doles. We feed them in soup lines; we give them little wooden plates and they go to one window and get a sandwich and we give them a cup in which to get some coffee. We are feeding thousands of men at a time in that manner. Doles at least give a man a permanent income, so that he can live with his family, but we are giving them the lowest kind of a hand-out three times a day.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. OLIVER of New York. I say that the Postmaster General who has 5,000 jobs vacant in his department now is doing the most defiant, the most heartless, and the most cruel and indefensible thing in keeping those jobs vacant when he has the men to fill them and the money with which to pay them. I can not find any vindication for his conduct. I say to him now, "Fill those jobs or step out and give some one else with a human heart, with a desire to be in step with the trend of the country an opportunity to guide the destinies of the Post Office Department."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I am supporting this bill providing a 44-hour week for postal employees in spite of the adverse report of the Postmaster General. I must also disagree with the Postmaster General on another of his recommendations, and that is with respect to his proposal to increase the postal rates on first-class mail. I can not agree with him about that, and I hope this Congress will turn him down when he brings that measure before the House.

I believe that every person who works should have at least a half day during the week for recreation and for relaxation, and I am hopeful that the passage of this measure will be an influencing example and inspiration to the merchants of the country and the business men of the country to give every employee in their establishments at least a half day off during the week. I would like to see every clerk in every grocery store and every clerk in every dry-goods establishment and every clerk in every insurance office and in every law office and in every public-utility office in the United States have a half day off in each work week. I think ultimately we are coming to this. It is needed for family shopping. It is needed for fishing, for hunting, for a week-end trip once in a while, and for proper, wholesome recreation.

By giving this half day off to the postal workers, this will bring the question directly before every business man in the United States, because they will take notice of the fact in all of our districts back home that the postal employees of the United States Government enjoy it. I think eventually every employee in private business will be accorded a half day off each work week. I know that all of these other employees generally would be thus favored if they were well organized. The only reason they do not enjoy this now is that they are not organized, and I am in favor of them having a proper organization to secure for them needed privileges and benefits.

I am glad to give my vote to the postal clerks and all postal employees in support of this measure. I think they are entitled to it. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Chairman, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK].

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, it gives me peculiar pleasure to support this legislation because I feel that in a way I have some knowledge of the problems that beset the postal worker. It so happens that about 19 years ago this month I was employed in the House post office over here in the House Office Building. So I have some personal knowledge, I may say to you, of the stress that is faced by the postal worker in getting the mail out on time. The men who serve us in our Postal Service work against time always. There are times, of course, when the mail is light and they have an easier time than at other times; but it often happens that the mail is very heavy, and, regardless of the volume of the mail, they must handle it in the same length of time.

There is another reason I take peculiar pleasure in supporting this legislation. The men who work in the Postal Service in my district have no time for recreation under the present law except at night. We do not have theaters and such recreation facilities in Atlanta on Sundays. The passage of this legislation will give those men an opportunity on Saturday afternoon, or some other afternoon in the week, to enjoy some recreation.

I hope, my friends, this bill will be followed by the passage of the McCormack bill applying to other employees of the Government and extending to them the same 44-hour schedule. It seems to me the time is peculiarly fitting for us to shorten the hours of labor.

I do not want to make a speech on unemployment, but we all know that the tendency of the times has been for many years to speed up the work of the Nation. Men now perform more work in the same number of hours than they did years ago. They ought to get some benefit in shorter

hours from this speeding-up process. It is a great pleasure for me to see this bill on its way to passage, and I know it is going to bring comfort and happiness to thousands of men throughout the country. [Applause.]

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN.]

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I extend thanks to the leaders of this House who has at last permitted this bill to come before us for a vote, and to my colleague, JIM MEAD, of New York, who sponsored the original bill, as well as to Mr. KENDALL, of Pennsylvania, whose name is attached to the pending measure, I offer my congratulations. I feel that I can speak not only for myself, but also for the postal employees of St. Louis, who I know are most grateful to all who have fought for this legislation. This indeed will be a Christmas present for them. No group of men in the Government service are more faithful or work harder than those who handle the mail. Why should they not receive this recognition? Time and again on Saturday afternoons I have been in my office and the only visitor would be the mail carrier. Business suspended, no one to read the letters they bring, but still they carry out their schedule while the patrons of the service are enjoying an afternoon off. Many of our leading labor organizations have adopted a 5-day week. The shops and offices are likewise closed on Saturday, and at the present time this extends to some of our railroad offices. Heretofore they have always enjoyed the 44-hour week, but they have gone further and adopted the 5-day week. When this bill passes the Senate, which it is sure to do at this session, the postal employees will simply be placed upon a parity with those employed by private corporations.

I can not but indorse the views of my colleague, Mr. FITZPATRICK, of New York, who urges that the thousands of vacancies in the Postal Service be filled. My city is affected the same as the great city of New York. The vacancies caused by death, resignation, and retirement have not been filled. A resident of my district, an ex-service man, passed the examination for carrier, attained an average of 100 per cent, is first on the register, still he can not be appointed. The postmaster would welcome a man of his ability, but rules and regulations coming from Washington prevent appointments. In this time of unemployment surely the Government should be last to fail to fill vacancies that occur among the personnel. The work has naturally increased. Some deliveries have been curtailed, this in the outlying districts, but the willingness of the men to perform the duties assigned regardless of the additional burdens is exemplified by the fact that during my service in Congress I have had but two complaints from my constituents relative to the delivery and collection of mail. This speaks for itself. The credit belongs to the men—the men who you are to-day granting by your votes a half holiday on Saturday. Regardless of the feeling of those at the head of the Postal Service, I say this legislation is just and our action will be commended by the public. [Applause.]

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, after many years of hope, expectation, and effort, an opportunity is presented to the House to pass upon a bill providing for a 44-hour work week for those in the service of the Post Office Department of our Government. The dreams of many thousands of persons who are affected by this bill and their many friends in and out of the Congress are about to be attained. If there is any class of Federal employees who are entitled to consideration, particularly along the lines as outlined in the pending bill, it is those who will benefit by its passage and enactment into law. While all persons in the Federal service give to the Government, their employer, the best that is in them, none surpasses the high character of service to Government and to the public rendered by those affected by the pending bill. There are few classes, if any, in the Federal service whose duties are harder and whose responsibilities are greater than those in the Postal Service. The activities of this great department extends

everywhere, and its success has been dependent upon the sterling services given by its employees. There is no department that calls for greater adherence to one's work and the acquiring of experience and the application of loyalty and experience for the public's benefit than the Post Office Department. Such services are appreciated by the general public. If this bill could be submitted to the people of the country on a referendum it would carry practically unanimously—in any event, overwhelmingly. It should pass the House in the same manner. I can see no logical argument, either theoretical or practical, that can be properly advanced against the passage of the pending legislation.

At the present time, while technically working 48 hours each week, those in the Postal Service actually work much longer. I know of many friends of mine employed in that department who directly or indirectly work on an average in excess of nine hours each day. They get in earlier than they are supposed to in order to prepare and sort their mail; they cut down their lunch hour for the same and other purposes connected with their work, and at night they remain longer, doing it willingly, but at a sacrifice to themselves and their families in order that the public might receive the service that it is entitled to. While such conditions exist, and the employees meet them willingly, it is only natural and proper that they should expect that they should some day be remedied. This bill will remedy such conditions to some extent.

I have seen many employed in the Boston district work six and seven years as temporary substitutes or as permanent substitutes, or both, either clerk or carrier, before receiving an appointment as permanent employees. I assume that such conditions exist elsewhere throughout the service. During this period of service, before receiving a permanent appointment, their work and salary is uncertain, and for a good part of that period their salary is small. However, they carry on, giving the best that is within them. I am informed that one of the reasons for this long period of temporary employment, of the failure to make permanent appointments as vacancies occur, is because of economy. Such economy is false and unfair to the employee. The relevancy of this argument to the bill under consideration is to show the loyalty of those in the service of this department and the character of service that they render.

The pending bill is of greater significance than heretofore. We are confronted by an unemployment condition that is without parallel in the history of our country. While we have had similar periods and experiences in the past, in none of them were we confronted with some of the fundamental causes which contribute to the present situation. One of the underlying reasons which led up to the acuteness of the present conditions, and which will always remain with us, is the evil or harmful effect which has flown from the substitution of machinery for human labor. It is true that the human race has benefited from mass production through the use of machinery, but it is also true that the benefits derived have not been distributed so as to prevent great evils arising therefrom.

One of the evils, and the great one, is the number of persons that have been and will continue to be thrown out of their employment and onto the street called "unemployment" as a result of machinery taking their places, and with no increased industrial activity or new business to reabsorb them into industry. It is conservatively estimated that throughout the country the number of displaced workers is approximately 2,500,000, and that number will keep increasing unless something is done to minimize this condition. The machine era has brought benefit to mankind, but it has also brought conditions of a harmful nature.

With the return to normalcy this evil will continue to exist; it is a progressive condition. It is the duty and obligation of industry and government to consider ways and means of removing the evil effects that have followed the substitution of machinery for man power. Within their own spheres of activity they should both strive for a more equitable distribution of the benefits of mass production, and this should be done in a manner consistent with our

theory of government. Tremendous industrial activity would only be a temporary relief, leaving the problem still open, which would have to be met some day. Judging by present conditions the industrial activity necessary to give work to displaced workers is something that can not even be predicted to-day. One other way to reabsorb displaced workers would be by the creation of new industries. Judging existing conditions, that is also out of the question. Here and there a new business is and might in the future be created, but nothing appears on the horizon from which we might expect that millions of displaced workers might secure employment. We are confronted with the duty and responsibility of trying to solve this problem, based upon existing conditions.

One of the means through which this condition can be minimized—not completely removed—is by a shorter work week for public and private employees without a reduction in wages or salary. It is apparent to me that in the near future the 5-day work week will prevail generally. This movement has the support of many persons and organizations who feel that existing conditions, if continued much longer, are likely to enter the stage where people out of employment are likely to think and act irrationally. Such would be the ultimate results of economic slavery. Employment is necessary for the spiritual and material welfare of not only people but of a nation.

The harmful effects of machine substitution for human labor has reached the stage where government should act, and act quickly. Before government interferes in the present situation with the orderly conduct of private business it should exhaust all means of persuasion and influence. If necessary, then it will have to act. If such an occasion should arise, I would feel constrained to vote for legislation that I would never vote for under ordinary conditions.

If necessary, which time I hope will never arrive, I would vote for practically any legislation that would hold intact our present system and theories of government, even at the expense of some of our classes of citizens. However, the Federal Government can lead the way toward the 5-day work week for its employees, which would go a long way toward reducing the harmful conditions following machine substitution. Other means can also be considered and devised, which in conjunction with the 5-day work week would practically remove these evils. This action by the Federal Government would have great influence on private industry.

The passage of the present bill is a step in that direction. Irrespective of existing conditions, those in the Postal Service are entitled to this legislation. In view of present conditions we should speedily pass this bill and its companion measure, the Saturday half-holiday bill, affecting practically the remainder of those in the Federal service. By doing this we will show the country that we appreciate the evils that have followed the substitution of machinery, and that within our own jurisdiction we are in part meeting it by providing for a shorter work week for our employees. By doing this we will tend to influence business to the consideration of a 5-day work week, an influence which would be greater if we were to inculcate such a principle into law. The welfare of the people—all of us, individually and collectively—and the best interests of our existing institutions of Government, which all true Americans love, require a solution of this great evil. [Applause.]

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to my colleague from New York [Mr. BOYLAN].

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the committee, I congratulate the committee, first, on reporting out this very meritorious measure. I am particularly glad that they have at last realized the importance of helping our postal employees.

You know that the Post Office Department is the most popular department of the Government. It is close to our hearts. There are other departments of the Government that we are not so keen about. Of course, sometimes the Treasury Department, through the Internal Revenue Bureau, gives us some very painful moments; and we are not alto-

gether in love with that department, or, again, the Prohibition Department is not so popular with many of our citizens. There is not a man, woman, or child in the country to whom the Postal Service of this Government does not render some service, whether it be a letter sought at home from the absent member of the family or whether it be a member of the family in a great city looking for a message from the old home or the old farm—in all these instances the post office has a human touch, a touch that brings it close to our hearts.

As one having some experience in both State and National Legislatures I have always marveled at the slowness of the State and Nation to respond to the trend of the times. The trend now is for a shorter week, for a 5-day week. The great captains of industry agree on this. All we ask here is for a 5½-day week. So we should not be hesitant or reluctant in granting it.

I can remember, and you can remember, in the large cities when the merchant thought he would not do a good holiday business unless he kept an open store until 10 o'clock at night, keeping the poor employees working from 8 o'clock in the morning until 10 o'clock at night. When all stores closed at 6 o'clock it was found that the same volume of business was transacted in the shorter time.

You know in the country districts where the fellows who sit around on the cracker barrels entered a protest because the country storekeeper wanted to close a little earlier, but after he had done so the Nation still survived. You know that when we tried to curtail the Sunday work how in the large cities we prohibited the barber shop and shoe-shining places from keeping open everybody predicted that the male populace would be wearing whiskers and going about with muddy shoes, and yet their fears were not realized.

In conclusion I want to say that this is a just bill; that it is a slight effort to give justice to a loyal and devoted force of public employees, and I sincerely trust it will have your unanimous approval. [Applause.]

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GREENWOOD].

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, the Postal Service of our Government enters into every working corner to serve all classes of our people. When any improvement can be made to better social or economic conditions, I am glad to see the Government take the lead.

I want to congratulate the committee on reporting out a measure that has so much of human interest and improvement as this bill. It pleases me to see the Government take this advanced stand. The legislation will shorten the hours of labor and undoubtedly will lead to a 5-day week.

One of the most menacing things in this age with which we have to contend is the invention of machines for taking the place of the laboring man. I have observed for many years how capital uses machines to displace labor, which increases the profits of business and contributes but very little to those who labor. It would seem to me in this great age of invention and discovery that some of the cumulative advantage of machines should go to the men and women who work with their hands, and that there should be a better distribution of the profits of the machines, so that the laboring man could participate and have a portion of that advantage. Otherwise, the inventive genius of mankind will eventually destroy the opportunity of men to earn a livelihood. That is one of the problems of this day.

I am glad to see that in this period of depression those who employ labor show a tendency not to compel the laboring man to carry the great burden of these distressing times. I hope that wages may stay up in order that the purchasing power of our laboring classes may not be destroyed or reduced. One way to help in this matter of keeping the purchasing power at a high stage is to reduce the hours of labor and spread the volume of employment to a greater number. I am glad to see the Government take this advance stand, and I hope that other lines of endeavor, whether private or public, will eventually fall in and follow this example. I would like to see the laboring man have a 5-day week. This will provide for working people one day of

diversion and self-improvement besides the day of rest. I think that it would increase their purchasing power and their efficiency. I always like to see these movements of improvement that will advance the welfare of men and women who work with their hands. It often appears that in the distribution of the blessings of this life the producer has not always shared in the economic progress as he should. I think one of the solutions of the present-day depression is to allow labor to have the benefit both of higher wages and a wider distribution of the available employment to a larger number. The Postal Department may well lead in this economic advancement. It is a satisfaction to extend my support to what I believe is a very humane and wholesome piece of legislation. [Applause.]

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. IGOE].

Mr. IGOE. Mr. Chairman, in the contemplation of this legislation, which I favor so heartily, I believe it advisable to draw from the experience of the experts of Government service. I therefore desire to present at this time the speech at the last convention of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks of Charles F. Trotter, superintendent of Post Office Service Division, who tells us that—

Eight years ago, on July 1, 1921, there were 66,789 employees in first and second class post offices, including clerks, supervisory employees and laborers, but not letter carriers or motor-vehicle service employees. That was one employee for every \$6,050 of postal receipts. On the same date in 1928, seven years later (I don't happen to have the figures for 1929), there were 78,133 employees, or one for every \$7,930 of postal receipts. In other words, in 1928 each employee, through greater industry and increased efficiency (and there can be no other explanation of it), was turning out 31 per cent more work than in 1921. [Applause.]

GREATER PRODUCTIVITY

Let me state it another way. If the output had been the same per capita in 1928 that it was in 1921, then in 1928, instead of having 78,133 employees, we would have needed 102,354, or 24,221 more than we found necessary to carry on the work, a saving of 24,221 employees in one year on account of increased efficiency. That great saving of man power can not be ascribed to the introduction of labor-saving machinery, for there were almost no labor-saving devices introduced into the service during those seven years. The credit for it belongs to you men and women of the service. [Applause.]

LORD PRAISES SERVICE

Let me state the matter in a still different form by quoting a man who knows, and whose duty it was to know, Gen. Herbert M. Lord was Director of the Budget for seven years, 1922 to 1929, and how he did keep our noses down to the grindstone during those years in the matter of economy, but it was worth while and we acknowledge it now that it is over. The next seven years will be easier, now that we are used to it.

Since General Lord went out of office about three months ago he has published a series of very interesting articles on the operations and accomplishments of the Budget system. In one of his articles near the end of the series he paid a tribute to the Postal Service that made all of us who went through the fight with him feel mighty good, especially so because the Post Office Department was the only one of all the departments of the Government singled out by him for special commendation. He said:

"During the Budget period prodigious economies have been effected by the Postal Service. For instance:

"Revenues at first and second class post offices increased from \$404,000,000 in 1921 to \$632,000,000 in 1928, a rise of more than 55 per cent. That meant an increase of 55 per cent in work, too. The clerical man power to take care of this increase rose from 66,789 in 1921 to 77,901 in 1928, an increase of less than 17 per cent.

"Fifty-five per cent increase in business handled by a 17 per cent increase in personnel is a pretty good record, it seems to me, a record some of our big private institutions would be glad to make." [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I heartily favor the bill under consideration by the committee providing for a shorter Saturday workday in the Postal Service, and respectfully urge favorable consideration and an early report. I consider the postal employees very properly are asking the Congress to reduce their working schedules from 48 hours to 44 hours weekly. The nature of work performed by postal employees is severe and constitutes a great strain on the human system. The high rate of efficiency maintained by the department is amazing and, naturally, pleasing, and this is due to the sincerity and accuracy with which the work is done by those in the Postal Service. Congress has already recognized, by the provisions of the retirement law whereby persons in the Postal Service can retire at an earlier age than

practically all other Federal employees, that the nature of the work is arduous. I consider such recognition as an important piece of evidence, and it should receive great weight.

There is much more that could be said that I will not refer to at this time. The whole subject was ably discussed by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. MEAD] in an eloquent speech delivered in the House on January 23, 1930. I subscribe to his brilliant presentation of the facts and the reasons advanced by him for the enactment of such legislation into law. [Applause.]

Mr. SANDERS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL].

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I am speaking on this bill from the experience of a post-office clerk. When I was 18 years old I was assistant postmaster and clerk, and when I was 19 years old I was a railway mail clerk. When I was 26 years old I was postmaster of Peoria, and remained so for eight years. Consequently I have had some experience in the Postal Service. There is nothing, in my judgment, that would do more to bring about a good feeling with the clerks and the carriers and those employed in the post-office service than the passage of this bill. I really believe that if we could have made a 40-hour bill out of it it would have been better; but, on the other hand, I think we are starting in the right direction. When I look back to my experience in the post office at Peoria and see now men that I appointed as carriers, who then were only 23 years old, when I see their condition to-day, with their feet worn out, their backs humped over, having no pleasure to speak of during all of these 30 years, it brings to my mind the thought that you can not do too much for the post-office clerk and the carrier. He is on the job rain or shine. He has the mail to carry, small or large. He must convince people that he is doing his work satisfactorily continually, or he is reported and is demoted or laid off. When a man enters the Post Office Service he is a young man, because he takes the civil-service examination; but he is no different than the soldier who goes into the Army. When that man goes into the Post Office Service he goes in for life, and when he retires at 60 or 65 years of age, whatever the retirement age is, he retires as an old man. He is fit for nothing else. He has never had any education in any other line of business. Consequently, it seems to me that what ought to be done for him is to give him the least possible work you can give him by shortening his hours and giving him Saturday afternoon off. I do not believe that there is anything that can be done for the post-office employee that should not be done by the Congress of the United States. You should consider that these men average only about \$1,800 a year for a whole lifetime serving the people of the country. It is all very well to say if they do not like their jobs they can get out of it; but if you did not have good men you would not have good service. The reason the service is successful is because these men are all proficient. It is seldom that you can go through any post office and find any man who is either a drone or who is not on the job all of the time.

Away back before we had any of these hours, those of us who worked in the Post Office Service worked as long as 15 hours a day, but now the day has come when other people are not working that way, and there is no reason in the world why this bill should not receive the unanimous vote of every man on the floor of the House. I am strongly for this bill and would support a 40-hour bill. [Applause.]

Mr. SANDERS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KENDALL], the author of the bill.

Mr. KENDALL of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I happen to be the author of this bill. I am delighted to see the support that it has received from the membership of the House. I only wish the postal employees throughout the country might have had an opportunity to sit in the gallery of this House and hear the favorable comments they have received in the splendid addresses made here to-day. The bill has been so thoroughly discussed that I feel it is useless to add much to what has already been said.

The postal employees have worked 48 hours per week since 1913, and during that period have had but 15 days' leave with pay and 10 days' sick leave with pay per year, while the Government employees in all the departments in Washington work but 42 hours per week and receive 30 days' leave with pay and 30 days' sick leave with pay. In addition to that, during the summer months they are granted Saturday half holidays. It therefore seems entirely unfair that the postal employees throughout the United States should be penalized by working longer hours than the Government employees, including the postal departmental employees in the city of Washington.

We hear much nowadays about unemployment and the need for Government aid in solving this most difficult problem. Improved machinery and labor-saving devices have been responsible for increased productivity and largely decreased labor, and for that reason the country has been fully supplied with all the necessary commodities of life at a violent reduction of labor. To-day there are three and one-half million idle men in this country and one and one-half million idle women who are compelled to work for a livelihood but for whom there are no positions. It is therefore up to Congress to do all it can to solve the unemployment problem. I see no better way than shortening the hours of labor. While this bill has only reduced the hours of labor in the Postal Service by four hours per week, it is my conviction that the Government should fix a 40-hour week for all the governmental employees which would give employment to hundreds of thousands of people who are now unemployed and, in a great measure, would solve the unemployment situation. The 44-hour bill, which will cost approximately \$6,000,000 additional per year, will give employment to more than 5,000 substitute clerks who are now without employment and will solve the unemployment situation to that extent.

I might say here that the postal substitute employee situation is a disgrace. The Post Office Department has failed to fill thousands of vacancies with regular appointments. In the opinion of competent experts the service is undermanned and the employees are speeded beyond reasonable limits. The department made a so-called survey in 21 of the largest cities in the country and put into effect petty economies that are harmful to the service morale and are directly responsible for a curtailment of service to the public and the elimination of work opportunities for thousands of substitutes. In the 21 cities surveyed, from one to two deliveries of mail and collections of mail have been curtailed, thereby throwing out of employment thousands of substitutes who should have been kept on the pay roll in this period of unemployment.

There is no finer class of honest, conscientious, and devoted employees than those who carry on the great work of the Post Office Department. Mail is carried promptly and safely to all sections of the country. Postal clerks and carriers are so reliable and responsible that rarely is the mail miscarried or delayed. The employees have the service at heart and surely are entitled to have their work reduced from 48 to 44 hours per week.

I feel that this bill should be speedily enacted into law. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. No further time being asked on general debate, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That hereafter when the needs of the service require supervisory employees, special clerks, clerks, and laborers in first and second class post offices, and employees of the motor-vehicle service, and carriers in the City Delivery Service and in the village delivery service, and employees of the Railway Mail Service, to perform service in excess of four hours on Saturday they shall be allowed compensatory time for such service on one day within five working days next succeeding the Saturday on which the excess service was performed: *Provided*, That employees who are granted compensatory time on Saturday for work performed the preceding Sunday or the preceding holiday shall be given the benefits of this act on one day within five working days following the Saturday when said compensatory time was granted: *Provided further*, That the Postmaster General may, if the exigencies of the service require it, authorize the payment of overtime

for service in excess of four hours on the last three Saturdays in the calendar year in lieu of compensatory time: *And provided further*, That for the purpose of extending the benefits of this act to railway postal clerks the service of said railway postal clerks assigned to road duty shall be based on an average not exceeding 7 hours and 20 minutes per day for 306 days per annum, including a proper allowance for all service required on lay-off periods as provided in Post Office Department circular letter numbered 1348, dated May 21, 1921; and railway postal clerks required to perform service in excess of 7 hours and 20 minutes daily, as herein provided, shall be paid in cash at the annual rate of pay or granted compensatory time, at their option, for such overtime.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, after the word "that," strike out the word "hereafter."

Page 2, line 20, after the word "May," strike out the figures "21" and insert "12."

Page 3, line 1, after the word "time," insert "This act shall take effect at the beginning of the second quarter after its passage."

The committee amendments were severally agreed to.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I am not opposed to the bill. I think it is deserving legislation and hope that it will receive the unanimous vote of the House. I only regret that we can not go a little further and aid the thousands upon thousands of other employees and the millions of those who are out of employment.

I believe that we should reduce the working hours of Government employees in order to give more of the unfortunates who are now out of employment an opportunity to earn an existence or a living. To this end I would be willing even to reduce the number of days that they be employed.

At all times I have supported legislation that would be helpful to the employees, and I am ready to do so now; but, Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, my attention has been called to conditions which exist in certain districts, where many of the Government employees are not deserving of consideration because of the fact that there are two or three members of one family employed in Government service. I am of the opinion that during these hard times we should not encourage such unjustifiable practice, and therefore we should ascertain how many of such families have two or three of their members on the pay roll. Not that I begrudge them their employment but because I am desirous of aiding those that are now out of employment and who are seeking work for at least one or two days a week so that they can exist.

I wonder whether Congress could act in this respect, and I believe it should. We have the power, and I think we should not hesitate therefore to create ten or fifteen or twenty thousand additional positions for these out-of-work unfortunates.

On yesterday we appropriated \$110,000,000 to relieve the unemployment condition. Unfortunately, only those in the rural sections of the country will be aided and helped, but the people in the large cities, in which exists the most suffering, will not be aided, helped, or relieved. I feel it is time that we should not only talk about the conditions that exist, but that we should extend real assistance to the starving millions of American citizens.

I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, contrary to the opinion held by many people, that we ought not to reduce hours of labor while so much unemployment exists, I think that one of the remedies for unemployment is a general reduction in the hours of labor. It must be clear to any thinking person that if the efficiency of labor increases by reason of the constant development and use of improved machinery, the time will come when a very few people employed to operate automatic machinery will be able to produce all of the material needed to supply the material things required by mankind. Surely it will not be claimed that the many millions of those whose labor has

been saved by such improved machinery must be compelled to vanish from the earth. Surely it will not be urged because the labor needed to produce the wealth of the country may be reduced to a tenth of what it now is, that the nine-tenths of the people must jump into the ocean.

Sooner or later we must recognize the fact that as improved methods of production are devised, and as improved machinery is adopted and therefore the efficiency of labor is increased, we must make a corresponding reduction in the amount of time devoted by labor to the production of the things required by the American people.

So, while this bill applies in only a small degree the principle of reducing the hours of labor of employees, it is a step in the right direction. I am in favor of a more comprehensive effort to reduce the hours of labor of those employed by the Government, because it will lead to a reduction in every line of work, whether private or public, and help to prevent the recurring evil of unemployment, which brings so much disaster and suffering to the American people.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of this legislation. I think it is meritorious. I believe when enacted into law it will inure not only to the benefit of the postal employees but to the Postal Service.

The bill now under consideration is known as the Kendall bill for a 44-hour week in the Postal Service.

Private industry is leading us toward shorter working hours and Saturday half holidays. Some of the largest business enterprises have carried out the purposes of this measure and have reported that it was beneficial from a production standpoint. I believe that the postal employment should be kept in line as far as possible with private employment. I believe the same good results will follow. The employees in the Post Office Department in executive offices in Washington now have a basic 42-hour week and during the summer months have a half holiday by order of the President, so with enactment of this law postal employees in the field service will be worked longer hours than the postal employees in Washington.

The enactment of this bill into law will make it necessary to use the services of substitutes to make up part of the compensatory time granted regular employees who work in excess of four hours on Saturdays. This will mean additional expense, but will help relieve unemployment of substitutes. Many of them are receiving a very small income. The use of these substitutes will make the postal workers a more efficient body.

When the needs of the service require employment of the postal employees on Saturday afternoons they will be given compensatory time on one of the five working days following. This bill will not have the effect of closing the doors of the post office on Saturday afternoons, but only provides that postal employees be given four hours off on Saturday where no injury will be done to the service.

It is impossible to estimate the cost of this measure. Many postmasters have reported that the cost will be absorbed in their offices. Estimates of the cost range from \$2,000,000 upwards. However, every dollar spent will go as wages to substitutes who are now unemployed to a very large extent. In this way it will aid in relieving the unemployment situation which is so widespread all over the country. I am not concerned so much about the additional cost as I am in the service and the postal employees.

This bill does not apply to rural letter carriers for the reason that they are on an hourly basis. During my entire service in the Congress I have always favored legislation in behalf of the postal employees, including the rural letter carriers, and in doing so I feel that I not only rendered them service but rendered service to the people whom they serve. We have the best Postal Service of any country in the world and we are indebted very largely to the faithful and efficient services of the postal employees for the same. I urge that this bill be enacted into law at the earliest possible date. I trust that it will pass the House unanimously. [Applause.]

Mr. SANDERS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill with amendments back to the House with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HOOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6603) to provide a shorter work day on Saturdays for postal employees, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to, and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. SANDERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and the amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded upon any of the amendments? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The question was taken; and the bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended to read: "A bill to provide a shorter work week for postal employees, and for other purposes."

ALLOTMENT OF FEDERAL AID FUNDS FOR THE STATE OF ALABAMA

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD a letter from the Chief of the Bureau of Public Roads with reference to the present status of the allotment of Federal-aid funds for the State of Alabama.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The letter is as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS,
Washington, D. C., December 8, 1930.

Hon. W. B. BANKHEAD,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BANKHEAD: I have your letter of December 5 asking for certain information relative to Federal aid and flood relief funds for the State of Alabama.

Under the law Federal-aid funds are apportioned to the States not later than January 1 next preceding the commencement of the fiscal year for which authorized. These funds remain available for obligation on specific projects through formal agreement with the Secretary of Agriculture for a period of two years following the fiscal year for which they are authorized. Funds not so obligated at the end of this extra 2-year period must be reapportioned among all the States.

The following statement shows the status of the unobligated balances of Federal aid funds apportioned to the State of Alabama as of December 1, 1930:

Fiscal year	Unobligated balance	Availability expires
1930.....	\$64,472.96	June 30, 1932
1931.....	2,595,620.00	June 30, 1933
1931 ¹	7,015.00	Do.
1932.....	2,615,434.00	June 30, 1934
	5,282,541.96	

¹ Reapportionment of \$326,864.96 of lapsed Hawaii Federal-aid funds.

The total appropriation for flood relief in Alabama amounted to \$1,660,000, of which \$326,287.13 had been disbursed to December 1, 1930. Of this amount, \$325,468.66 have been paid to the State as a reimbursement for restoration work done prior to the passage of the flood relief act (March 12, 1930). On December 1, 2 miles of road were under construction and an additional 20.3 miles had been approved for construction on flood-relief projects. The act appropriating the flood-relief funds made them available to June 30, 1931. The estimates of the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1932 carry an item making the unexpended balances of these funds available until June 30, 1932.

Similar inquiries have been received from other members of the Alabama congressional delegation as a result of letters from Mr. J. A. Rountree, director general United States Good Roads Association, Birmingham, Ala. We also received the same inquiry direct from Mr. Rountree.

Very truly yours,

THOS. H. MACDONALD,
Chief of Bureau.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On December 3, 1930:

H. J. Res. 393. Joint resolution making an appropriation for the United States Massachusetts Bay Colony Tercentenary Commission; and

H. R. 10387. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to deliver to the custody of the city of Denver, Colo., the ship's bell, plaque, war record, name plate, and silver service of the cruiser *Denver* that is now or may be in his custody.

On December 4, 1930:

H. J. Res. 384. Joint resolution making appropriations available to carry into effect the provisions of the act of the Seventy-first Congress entitled "An act to fix the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan police force and the fire department of the District of Columbia."

On December 5, 1930:

H. R. 9267. An act for the relief of John A. Fay.

On December 8, 1930:

H. R. 736. An act to authorize the cession to the city of New York of land on the northerly side of New Dorp Lane in exchange for permission to connect Miller Field with the said city's public sewer system.

TO PERMIT RAILROAD AND ELECTRIC-CAR COMPANIES TO PROVIDE MAIL TRANSPORTATION BY MOTOR VEHICLE IN LIEU OF SERVICE BY TRAIN

Mr. SANDERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 12412) authorizing the Postmaster General to permit railroad and electric-car companies to provide mail transportation by motor vehicle in lieu of service by train, and ask for its immediate consideration. This bill is on the House Calendar.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York calls up a bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Postmaster General is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to permit railroad and electric-car companies to provide mail transportation by motor vehicle over highways in lieu of service by train, the compensation for such service to be at a rate not in excess of the rate that would be allowed for similar service by railroad or electric car, payment therefor to be made from the appropriate appropriation for railroad transportation and mail messenger service or electric and cable car service.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SANDERS] is recognized for one hour.

Mr. SANDERS of New York. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY].

Mr. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, just a word in explanation of the measure. This bill simply meets an actual necessity of modern transportation. Railroad trains are being taken off and that means that the mail service on those trains can not be continued and that there must be other means provided. The Postmaster General recommends that he be permitted to enter into contracts with those railroads or street-car companies in order that they may transport the mail by motor busses at no higher rates than are covered in the contracts with the railroad companies.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY. I yield.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. The gentleman just stated that this would not permit a higher rate, but will the gentleman accept an amendment which will insert after the word "train" the words "proper adjustment of the compensation for such service to be made in each instance, but in no case at a higher rate in excess"? The gentleman will realize that where

you have this new mode of transportation in all likelihood the overhead is not as great as that for a railroad, and the Government ought to get the advantage of the cheaper rate of transportation. I believe that in each case where a railroad carrier seeks to change the mode of transportation there should be an adjustment so that the figures would be presented to the department, and if the department can get a lower rate all right, and then provide, but in no case in excess of the present rate. The gentleman can readily see that if the railroads are going to take obsolete lines and hold them dead, go into the motor transportation business, and charge all of their overhead to the operation of the motor lines we will never get any advantage.

Mr. KELLY. Of course, the gentleman understands the mode of payment. It is not on operation of capital or overhead, but the payment is made on a fixed-space basis, the lowest space being 3 feet and up to an entire mail car.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. The gentleman also knows that the rate is fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission, and they take all of these factors into consideration. Now, in order not always to carry the load of antiquated and obsolete lines it seems to me that in each case we should have an adjustment which the Post Office Department can invoke, during the life of the contract, of course, and that in no case should the rate be in excess of the present rate, and in all likelihood in many instances they will be able to get a lower rate. As the gentleman knows, this is one of the largest expenditures we have.

Mr. KELLY. I am inclined to believe the amendment will do no harm to the measure. The only point is that the Interstate Commerce Commission fixes a regular space rate for all railroads, the lowest space being 3 feet, and leading up to a 60-foot mail car.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Exactly. They fix the rate for the transportation of mail by the railroads, but during the life of the contract the railroads come in and seek to change their mode of transportation. In that instance I say they should make an adjustment of the contracts and in no case in excess of the rates now paid.

Mr. KELLY. If the gentleman will permit, I think that point is covered in the bill, but if there is any value in the gentleman's suggestion I am sure the committee would not object to an amendment. However, the fact is that the rate is fixed uniformly now, and there will be adjustments, of course, under that provision.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I want to provide for this rate adjustment.

Mr. HOGG of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY. Yes.

Mr. HOGG of Indiana. I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] is well in point. However, I do believe it is covered in the bill, but the gentleman's amendment simply states the intent more fully. That being so, I would suggest that the committee agree to it.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. At the proper time I will offer it, and I can not do any more.

Mr. COLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY. Yes.

Mr. COLE. Does this legislation apply only to busses operated by railroads and electric companies?

Mr. KELLY. Where those motor busses are operated for the transportation of any mail which has previously been carried on trains but which can no longer be carried by trains.

Mr. COLE. No man operating a bus outside of a railroad company or an electric company could carry those mails?

Mr. KELLY. Not over the routes where the railroads formerly carried the mail, unless the Postmaster General thought it best to open the route for bids.

Mr. SANDERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I have serious doubts whether we should pass this bill. It places no restriction upon the Postmaster General in the payment for the transportation of mail over routes covered by motor busses other than the rates can not exceed those now paid for such car-

riage by train. The purpose of this bill is to give the railroads a preferential advantage over competing bus lines. It is to take the carriage of mail by busses outside of the competitive field and make it a monopolistic affair, to be arranged by the Postmaster General and the railroads. When we had only railway mail transportation, of course, there was no competition. That was a monopoly service, because the Post Office Department needed the advantage of the expeditious character of the fast mail trains. It was the only means of conveyance, and even then, the department had means of transporting the mails by star routes under competitive bids for four years.

Now, wake up, gentlemen! What does this bill do?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes; I will be pleased to yield to the gentleman in just a moment.

This bill gives a preferential advantage to the railroads in the carriage of the mail where bus service has been installed. Why should we single out the railroads that operate a special bus-line service and give them special consideration to receive whatever rate the Postmaster General may determine upon when it is an established principle of the Postal Service and of the star-route service, and has been for three-quarters of a century to my knowledge, that the carriage of mail by star routes, which is by motor service, shall be by competitive bids.

This is a bill designed to favor the railroads and to give them an exclusive privilege, and I am not in favor of it. Let us be frank about it. I now yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Was the gentleman well advised when he made his preliminary statement that there is no necessity for this proposed legislation, and that under existing law there is no restriction upon the Postmaster General in making these contracts if he should see fit to do so?

Mr. STAFFORD. The Postmaster General to-day has authority of law to enter into contract for the transportation of mail by bus service between any points he desires to establish such service.

Mr. BANKHEAD. If that is true, I will ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania what is the necessity for this bill, if the gentleman from Wisconsin is well advised with respect to existing law?

Mr. STAFFORD. I will say to the gentleman, in answer to that statement, that for four terms, during my first four terms in Congress, back in 1903 to 1911, I served on the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, and during those eight years I served on Subcommittee No. 1 that in those days had charge of the preparation of the Post Office appropriation bill, and I think I know whereof I speak; otherwise, I would not have been so positive in my assertion with respect to this measure.

I will now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Let us have some clarification by the gentleman in charge of the bill of this controversy.

Mr. STAFFORD. I will yield to the gentleman for that purpose if I can get a little more time, and I am sure I can.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The gentleman from Wisconsin takes the flatfooted position that there is no necessity for the passage of this bill inasmuch as the Postmaster General under existing law has authority to carry out the proposals of this bill. Is that admitted or is it denied, may I ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. KELLY. That is not admitted, and if the gentleman will allow me a word, I will show the necessity of this measure.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is the very purpose of my inquiry.

Mr. KELLY. If the gentleman from Wisconsin states the Postmaster General can now ask for bids on routes of various kinds, that is absolutely true.

Mr. STAFFORD. Now, the gentleman concedes my point. He says that the Postmaster General has the authority to ask for bids on any route he so desires and he confirms my position. Now, why should we give prefer-

ential advantage to the railroads in the carriage of the mails when there is competitive bus service between the same points?

Mr. KELLY. The gentleman will admit, I am sure, that there were two questions asked. The gentleman from Alabama asked one question and the gentleman from Wisconsin asked another question. The situation is that these railroads have been carrying the mails under the rates fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission and the traffic has become such that the mail trains are being taken off. The department desires to allow that railroad to carry the mail by bus over the line where it had previously carried it and at the same rate.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. I will ask the gentleman to yield me three minutes more.

Mr. SANDERS of New York. I yield the gentleman three minutes more.

Mr. STAFFORD. I then ask the gentleman why should not that service be open to competition just as is the case in the comparative service on the star routes? The gentleman says that the Post Office Department has the authority to-day to contract for the service of carrying the mails by bus lines, why restrict it?

Originally, as I said in my prefatory statement, there was no competition for the carriage of the mail by the railroads. It was a monopoly service from point to point and it was an expeditious service, and where there was not competitive service there were star routes. Now we have competitive conditions in the bus lines. Why should the railroads be singled out for preferential treatment? Why should they not be subjected to the same competitive rates as the star-route service?

Mr. KELLY. May I interpolate a statement there?

Mr. STAFFORD. Surely.

Mr. KELLY. Under the law a railroad is a common carrier, compelled to carry the mail at rates fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission. This bill does not permit the Postmaster General to put a new route under railroad control, but where mail has been taken off the railroad it provides that he may have it carried by bus line under railroad management, that is all.

Mr. STAFFORD. O Mr. Speaker, the gentleman refers to the rate fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission; that is merely a vagary. There is no competitive rate fixed by the commission. When we created the Parcel Post Service, if I may digress a moment, we authorized the Interstate Commerce Commission to fix the rates. They did not do anything at all. They just approved the action of the Post Office Department. We know nothing of the rates that could be fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

These rates should be determined on a competitive basis. Bus line after bus line is operating, and now you want to give an exclusive privilege between competitive points to the railroads.

I am not against the railroads, but I do not want them to be singled out for a higher rate that has no application to bus line carrier service, and that is what I am contending this bill gives—a preferential rate to the railroads, to be fixed not by competitive conditions but by the ipse dixit of the Postmaster General.

Mr. HASTINGS. In other words, as I understand it, if the railroad discontinues carrying the mail and it is to go to a bus line, the gentleman wants to have competitive bids from the bus lines?

Mr. STAFFORD. From the bus lines; yes.

Mr. HASTINGS. And not have it given to the bus line run by the railroad?

Mr. STAFFORD. No; certainly not.

Mr. HASTINGS. But let it be done by competitive bidding between them.

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes; and the Postmaster General has authority to do that. He only wants to have the rates for that character of service determined as if it was carried by the railroads. There are lines and lines, and I could take up

the time of the House by enumerating them, but that is not at all applicable, and I submit to the determination of the House the question of whether this bill should be adopted or not.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. SANDERS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MEAD].

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Speaker, I hold no brief for the railroads as against the bus and truck lines of the country, but I would call this to your attention: The railroads have accomplished a great deal in the upbuilding of this country. They have a very efficient and well-organized personnel. They employ high-class men, and in many instances and in many States they are regulated as to the number and character of their employees. Railroad companies own their own lines; contribute to the taxes of every town, city, and hamlet throughout the country. They are regulated by the Interstate Commerce Commission, while on the other hand the bus and truck lines are without these same regulations. The railroad employees undergo annual physical and mental examination. So I believe the railroads and their employees deserve some consideration.

Now I want to clear up a statement that was made that we are permitting the railroads by this bill to monopolize the mail service. Not only has the Post Office Department recommended this bill but it was considered by your Post Office Committee. Hearings were held by the committee and much time was given by the membership of the committee to the bill. It comes to you from the House Post Office Committee with their unanimous report.

The matter was referred to the Comptroller General, who has often been referred to as the watchdog of the Treasury, for a ruling as to whether there was any legal objection to authorizing payment to railroads and electric-car companies to provide mail transportation by motor vehicle in lieu of service by train.

The Comptroller General advised in effect that when mails for local points are transported, not by train but by bus and the service is performed by a subsidiary of the railroad or by an independent bus company, there is considerable doubt whether, as to such mail, the route retains its character as a "railroad route" within the meaning of the appropriation for railroad transportation and mail messenger service. In conclusion he stated further that his office will not for the present question otherwise proper payments to railroad companies for transporting mail when a part of the service is performed by means of busses, but if the practice is to continue beyond the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, there should be specific statutory authority therefore by change in the wording of the appropriation or otherwise.

Under the legislation requested it is proposed to continue the use of the bus facilities provided by the railroad companies in lieu of train service for the transportation of the mails. It should be understood that these facilities will only be utilized in cases where the service is more satisfactory and cheaper at railroad rates than could be obtained otherwise by star route under formal contract.

So, as I see it, Mr. Chairman, this bill does not give the railroads, the bus lines, or star-route contractors a monopoly in the delivery of mail, but, on the other hand, it continues the competitive methods of the past. [Applause.]

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, this bill presents a matter of sound business administration. It has nothing to do with whether you favor the railroads or favor the busses. Under existing law the rates for the railroad are fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission, and in fixing those rates they take as a guide the freight rates, all the factors that go into making and fixing reasonable rates.

Now, then, with the capitalization of the railroad and its overhead expenses, all the factors go into determining a reasonable rate fixed for railroad companies and mail contracts. After the railroads obtained these contracts on that basis it changes to bus transportation, and it says here that—

The compensation for such service to be at a rate not in excess of the rate that would be allowed for similar service by railroad or electric car.

Of course they would.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is the gentleman aware that in the transportation of mail there is one character of service paid for by space used, and there is the other, known as R. P. O. Service, where the mail clerks distribute the mail en route. The service contemplated by this bill is for carrying the mail in bags on the busses.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Not only that, but this will give, as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] says, an absolute monopoly to the railroads in the operation of busses, because with this advantage of coming in and getting the mail contract, as a matter of course, and then shifting it to the busses, it precludes and shuts out every possible competition for bus transportation on that route.

You can not justify that in any sense of the word. It is not a question of favoring the railroads or not, but it is giving the Government the benefit of new and cheaper means of transportation, and we should protect the Government to that extent and say to the railroads, "If you desire to transport by bus, then you come in with your offer of bus transportation and we will fix the rate as bus transportation and take into consideration other business, and in competition with other lines," but not under the present law which gives the railroads the contract, as a matter of course, and then let them shift to the bus, thereby shutting out forever real mail competition in bus transportation.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. As a matter of fact when these mail trains are discontinued to-day and a star route is established and advertised for the railroad is in no wise discriminated against. Its bus line has the same privilege of bidding on this work exactly the same as the other man has. If the railroad has the contract, it has the right to discontinue the rail service under the direction of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I hope the gentleman will not take all of my time.

Mr. SANDERS of New York. I yield the gentleman from New York two minutes more.

Mr. MICHENER. The railroad determines to take off a train; it notifies the Post Office Department that on a certain date it will discontinue this train, which is a mail train. The department then attempts to make temporary provision for the service.

They put a star route in operation at once, if necessary, which continues until they may settle the matter. Then they advertise for star-route service; and if the railroad company is running a bus, it has the same right to bid that an individual has.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. If that were so, there is no necessity for this bill.

Mr. MICHENER. That is what I am saying to you. The only thing this bill does is to permit the railroad to conduct a star route at railroad mail prices without being obliged to engage in competitive bidding. We have heretofore enacted legislation permitting the railroad company to make certain subvention contracts for the purpose of aiding indirectly the air service and for the purpose of aiding indirectly the merchant marine. We now permit the Postmaster General to make contracts at exorbitant prices, more than he could get the same work done for, for the purpose of subsidizing—we may as well be frank about the matter—and if we want to subsidize the railroads in a like way, let us come out and say so. Under existing law the railroad has the same opportunity to bid for star-route service as anyone else, and I know of no reason why we should change the situation, and I am opposed to the bill. [Applause.]

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I thank the gentleman. Now, let us stand by our guns and vote this bill down.

Mr. YON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New York [Mr. SANDERS] yield?

Mr. SANDERS of New York. Yes.

Mr. YON. Do I understand by this bill that the railroad goes out of business and they substitute a motor-bus service between the same communities, and that they will be permitted under this act, if it becomes a law, to make a deal with the Post Office Department whereby they will be permitted to carry the mail without bidding for the contract?

Mr. KELLY. There seems to be the idea that the passage of this bill would automatically compel a grant to the railroads without bids. The situation is that unless we take some action like this, on the 30th of June, 1931, the Post Office Department can no longer do what it has been doing in some instances—permit the railroads to carry the mail that otherwise was carried by train by motor bus. If this bill is not passed, it will be impossible for the Post Office Department to permit the railroad to carry the mail by motor bus, although they have been carrying it by train.

Mr. YON. I have in mind a section of my territory where the railroads were running trains on a tri-weekly schedule. The patrons of this service were not satisfied. Private individuals were interested in getting a better service. The question was taken up by the Post Office Department and the Post Office Department advertised for bids. The Government got the mail carried on this star-route service right alongside the railroad at a much cheaper rate than the railroad was paid.

Mr. KELLY. That will apply exactly the same after this bill is passed. It does not prevent using the cheapest form of transportation.

Mr. YON. There is another thing in connection with the mail service on railroads, where they have been carrying mail crews with mail clerks. Do you think it will be possible for them to put on mail clerks to distribute the mail?

Mr. KELLY. Trucks are under design right now for that very thing; that is, to have a distributing clerk inside the motor bus and the space is provided. There is no contract by the Post Office Department at the present for that, but busses are being constructed for such use in the future.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Busses operated by the railroads?

Mr. KELLY. They are simply being designed, but they will be in use by both railroad companies and bus companies under other control.

Mr. HOGG of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, as I understand this bill it is designed to hold the railroads to their contract, provided the Government can not make a cheaper rate by the star-route bids.

Mr. KELLY. That is exactly correct.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, no; your bill is directly the opposite. The department has that privilege to-day. This bill seeks to raid the Government.

Mr. DOWELL. They are compelled to advertise for bids. Mr. HOGG of Indiana. This gives the Government the right to continue the contract with the railroad if it desires to do so.

Mr. DOWELL. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. Without bidding.

Mr. HOGG of Indiana. I am not through. We have here the word of the Postmaster General that he does not intend to invoke this law unless after the bids are submitted on the star routes they are higher than the rates which he is getting from the railroads.

Mr. MICHENER. Let us put that in the law.

Mr. HOGG of Indiana. I am introducing an amendment to that effect.

Mr. DOWELL. Put that in the law.

Mr. MICHENER. This bill says to the railroad companies: "You may continue at the present rate, and we have authority to permit you to continue at the present rate without you being compelled to bid in competition with the others."

Mr. HOGG of Indiana. The committee did not think that we needed to watch the Postmaster General quite so closely.

Mr. MICHENER. I believe it is the duty of this Congress to at all times guard against everything which may eventually or at any time inure against the Government.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. And we may not always have the same Postmaster General.

Mr. YON. Are you proposing this legislation in order that the highways might take the place of the railroads and that the railroads could go out of business and then to exercise the same rights and privileges that are being given on the railroads by their mail contracts? That is, do you figure on the railroads going out of business and putting on a bus line to carry the mail?

Mr. KELLY. If the gentleman will permit, there are continually coming to the attention of all of us cases where local passenger traffic no longer justifies the carrying on of regular passenger service, and these trains are taken off. The mail car goes with them, and the space that has been used goes with them. Then it becomes necessary for the Post Office Department to provide for the transportation of that mail. In the past they have been permitting the railroad company, if they had bus service, to carry it by that method, and the rate paid was the rate paid under the railway mail act. Now, if we do not pass this bill, that no longer can be done after the end of this fiscal year. It will then be necessary to throw open every single point between local stops for bids by star route, and the lowest bidder will get it.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. What is wrong about that?

Mr. KELLY. I say that this will permit the Postmaster General, where he can get better service at a cheaper rate, to be enabled to allow the railroad to carry the mail that had been previously transported by train.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY. I yield.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Under what law or authority may the Postmaster General indulge in this practice until the end of the fiscal year and not thereafter?

Mr. KELLY. That is a matter that has been before the Comptroller General. The Postmaster General has done it, and the Comptroller General says he will permit it until the end of this fiscal year, but no longer.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Speaker, may I be recognized to make a point of order?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I make the point of order—and I submit that this point of order, under the precedents, may be made at any time before the conclusion of the consideration of a bill—that this purely legislative bill makes an appropriation out of existing appropriations, and I refer to the last four lines of the bill, reading:

Payment therefor to be made from the appropriate appropriation for railroad transportation and mail messenger service or electric and cable car service.

In so far as this language may provide for future appropriations, to be applicable, if made after the passage of this act, of course, the point of order would not lie, but, in so far as this act makes available, for this new purpose, existing appropriations not now available for that purpose, I submit that the bill makes an appropriation, and, therefore, it is subject to the rule which prohibits a legislative committee from reporting legislation containing appropriations.

I will say that I think perhaps the matter can be cured so as to be applicable after the 1st of July, but it can not be made applicable to appropriations for the present fiscal year.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to know against exactly what language the gentleman is making the point of order?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. It is the last four lines of the bill, which read as follows:

Payment therefor to be made from the appropriate appropriation for railroad transportation and mail messenger service or electric and cable car service.

The SPEAKER. The point of order is good.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Whatever the effect may be upon the balance of the bill, I am not pretending to say.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I yield.

Mr. DOWELL. Purely as a matter of parliamentary procedure, it occurs to me that this part of the bill is authorization for an appropriation to be made, and it is a legislative proposition in the last four lines, instead of an actual appropriation. There is no appropriation until the proper appropriating committee makes its report and secures passage of a bill making the appropriation.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Is there not an appropriation now for railroad transportation and mail-messenger service and electric and cable car service?

Mr. DOWELL. Not from this bill.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. But any appropriation now existing for this purpose is made available.

Mr. DOWELL. Shall be made from the appropriation for railroad transportation, and it occurs to me that, purely as a parliamentary proposition, it is authorization for an appropriation when the appropriating committee is desirous of making it so, and no payment will be made until a proper appropriation is made. That does not indicate that I am in favor of the bill.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Of course, I will say that if that were the actual effect of the language, this language would not be needed at all. There must be some purpose in using the language. You do not need to say "hereafter appropriations may be made" to carry out the purpose of this bill. The purpose of this language evidently is to make the present appropriations available for this purpose.

Mr. KELLY. I will say frankly that, of course, the idea is that the appropriation for railroad transportation and mail messenger service will be used for the payment of service performed under the terms of this bill.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Speaker, I submit that concedes the point of order.

The SPEAKER. The only question for the Chair to determine on the point of order as made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHINDBLOM] is as to whether the language referred to is or is not an appropriation.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. May I interrupt the Speaker to state that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY] just said, and I do not know whether the Speaker heard it or not, that he conceded, in a spirit of frankness, which characterizes the gentleman, that the intention is to use existing appropriations at once for this purpose.

Mr. KELLY. No. I did not concede it was a direct appropriation.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. No; but it was the intention to use existing appropriations for this purpose.

Mr. KELLY. Certainly. I made that statement.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The purpose of the language is to use present appropriations?

Mr. KELLY. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The language complained of by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHINDBLOM] is as follows:

Payment therefor to be made from the appropriate appropriation for railroad transportation and mail messenger service or electric and cable car service.

It occurs to the Chair that this language refers directly to an appropriation already made, not an appropriation for the future or an authorization for the future. It is apparent that the existing appropriation to-day is only for the purpose of railroad transportation and mail messenger service and electric and cable car service.

This bill proposes that the payment for transportation by bus lines can be made out of this existing appropriation.

In Cannon's Precedents, section 9156, is found the following syllabus of a decision analogous to the situation presented here:

A proposition to reappropriate or make available an appropriation previously made or to divert such appropriation to any other purpose than that for which originally made is equivalent to a direct appropriation and is not in order in connection with a bill reported by a committee without authorized jurisdiction to report appropriations.

Also, in section 9157, is found the following:

Legislative direction that funds previously appropriated be used for a purpose not specified in the original appropriation was held to be an appropriation in contravention of section 4 of Rule XXI.

Again, in section 9961, is found the following:

Direction to departmental officers to pay determinable amounts from unexpended balances is equivalent to an appropriation.

It has been held (Cannon's Precedents, sec. 9153) that—

The point of order that a bill reported by a nonappropriating committee contains an appropriation is properly directed to the item of appropriation and not to the act of reporting the bill. If the point of order is directed to the item of appropriation, that item only is eliminated.

It seems quite clear to the Chair that this is a direct appropriation, and a point of order against those words having been made by the gentleman from Illinois, the Chair, following the decision just given, will rule that those words go out, but the rest of the bill stands.

Mr. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KELLY. The Speaker having ruled on that point, I understand that in line 8, after the word "car," the remainder of the bill would be stricken out under the point of order.

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. KELLY. So that the bill would end with the words "electric car."

The SPEAKER. Exactly.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Illinois makes a point of order against certain words he is privileged to do so, but I make a point of order against the whole bill in that the committee had no jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in the bill, and that is to direct appropriations for something not heretofore authorized by law.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not think he is called upon to rule on the merits of the suggestion, as the Chair thinks the gentleman's point of order comes too late, inasmuch as the bill has been regularly reported by the committee and taken up by the House, and the objectionable words having been stricken out.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. As a matter of fact, have they been stricken out?

The SPEAKER. The Chair so ruled. The Chair ruled that those words went out, but the rest of the bill stood.

Mr. KELLY. Also, this is an authorization which no other committee of the House would have authority to report.

The SPEAKER. That question is not directly involved.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. KELLY. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. On the merits of the bill. If I understood the gentleman, in reply to questions asked, he claimed that this bill would not compel the Postmaster General to grant a monopoly to railroads, but that it would merely permit the Postmaster General to do so. Was that the substance of the gentleman's statement?

Mr. KELLY. I did not use any such words as that, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. BLANTON. But that was the substance, as I understood the gentleman's reply.

Mr. KELLY. Here is what I did say: That the Postmaster General finds himself in a position where he desires to allow railroads which have been carrying the mails on trains to carry them on busses, at not above the regular rate fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission. It is a Post Office Department measure.

Mr. BLANTON. My idea of the characteristics of the service of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania is that he does not want to grant any monopoly to any railroad.

Mr. KELLY. My friend is right. I certainly do not want to do that.

Mr. BLANTON. In my State a trunk line, the Texas & Pacific Railroad Co., which runs 900 miles from El Paso to Texarkana through my State, and which is the only railroad in my State which has a Federal charter, has been discontinuing various stations along its line, and not permitting its passenger trains to stop at these little stations, and putting on bus lines which are using our highways. Those busses are crowding passenger cars off the highways into the ditches if they do not get out of the way. Is not that going to be the result of this bill? Is not railroad after railroad going to discontinue passenger service and their mail trains and use the highways with bus service?

Mr. KELLY. If my friend will permit, I will say that the committee had before it the express statement of Postmaster General Brown stating that in no case would he allow a railroad to carry mail under this provision unless it was at a cheaper rate and a more satisfactory service.

Mr. BLANTON. But the gentleman can not agree with the Postmaster General on many of his proposals. The gentleman can not agree with his proposal to increase the rate on first-class mail.

Mr. KELLY. That is right.

Mr. BLANTON. And your committee can not agree with him, nor can the gentleman from Pennsylvania agree with him on his proposals in other bills which the Post Office Committee is going to bring up, one proposal being to tax the business men and people generally of the United States 5 cents on directory service.

Mr. KELLY. I find myself gratified when I can agree with him on anything. I do agree with him on this provision.

Mr. BLANTON. It does look as though this would permit him to grant a monopoly to the railroads of the country.

Mr. KELLY. That was not the intention of the committee.

Mr. BLANTON. I do not believe I can support this bill. I believe that it should be defeated.

Mr. HOCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY. Yes.

Mr. HOCH. In a case where there are two bus lines operating between the same points and one of these bus lines is owned and operated by a railroad and the other is not, is it not true that under the language of this bill the Postmaster General would be authorized to grant the contract to the railroad bus line in spite of the fact that the other bus line was willing to carry the mail at a lesser rate?

Mr. KELLY. He would have that authority, unless he did what he told us he intended to do, namely, get a cheaper rate under the railroad contract.

Mr. HOCH. But as far as the statute is concerned, there is nothing which would compel him to let the contract to the other bus line, which would be willing to carry the mail at a lesser rate.

Mr. KELLY. As far as the committee knows, there has never been any complaint about the present situation, and the railroads have been permitted to carry the mail on busses in certain instances.

Mr. DOWELL. And that, of course, is because he has not had this authority.

Mr. KELLY. He has been exercising it.

Mr. DOWELL. This law was not in effect.

Mr. KELLY. No.

Mr. DOWELL. He has authority to request the submission of bids, and he has given the contract to the one submitting the most favorable bid?

Mr. KELLY. No; that is not the situation. He has allowed the railroad companies to carry it in some cases.

Mr. DOWELL. I mean, where there was no transportation by rail.

Mr. SANDERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Under the rule, would I be recognized to submit a motion to recommit?

The SPEAKER. At the proper time the Chair will recognize the gentleman.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I ask for such recognition.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I move to recommit the bill to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands the gentleman is opposed to the bill?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I am.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York submits a motion to recommit, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LA GUARDIA moves to recommit the bill (H. R. 12412) to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SPROUL of Illinois) there were—ayes 71, noes 37.

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was recommitted was laid on the table.

RETURN RECEIPTS FOR DOMESTIC REGISTERED AND INSURED MAIL

Mr. SANDERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 8649) to authorize the Postmaster General to collect an increased charge for return receipts for domestic registered and insured mail when such receipts are requested after the mailing of the articles.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. SANDERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. BLANTON, Mr. LA GUARDIA, and Mr. BANKHEAD objected.

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Accordingly the House automatically resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8649) to authorize the Postmaster General to collect an increased charge for return receipts for domestic registered and insured mail when such receipts are requested after the mailing of the articles, with Mr. HOCH in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I object. It is a short bill and I think it should be read.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3928 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by section 210 of Title II of an act entitled "An act reclassifying the salaries of postmasters and employees of the Postal Service, readjusting their salaries and compensation on an equitable basis, increasing postal rates to provide for such readjustment, and for other purposes," approved February 28, 1925 (43 Stat. 1068; U. S. C., title 39, sec. 386), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3928. Whenever the sender shall so request, and upon payment of a fee of 3 cents at the time of mailing or of 5 cents subsequent to the time of mailing, a receipt shall be obtained for any registered mail matter, showing to whom and when the same was delivered, which receipt shall be returned to the sender, and be received in the courts as prima facie evidence of such delivery: *Provided further,* That upon payment of the additional sum of 20 cents at the time of mailing, a receipt shall be obtained for any registered mail matter, showing to whom, when, and the address where the same was delivered, which receipt shall be returned to the sender, and be received in the courts as prima facie evidence of such delivery."

SEC. 2. Paragraph (a) of section 211 of Title II of an act entitled "An act reclassifying the salaries of postmasters and employees of the Postal Service, readjusting their salaries and compensation on an equitable basis, increasing postal rates to provide for such readjustment, and for other purposes," approved February 28, 1925 (43 Stat. 1069; U. S. C., title 39, sec. 245), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 211. (a) The fee for insurance shall be 5 cents for indemnification not to exceed \$5; 8 cents for indemnification not to exceed \$25; 10 cents for indemnification not to exceed \$50; and 25 cents for indemnification not to exceed \$100. Whenever the sender of an insured article of mail matter shall so request, and

upon payment of a fee of 3 cents at the time of mailing, or of 5 cents subsequent to the time of mailing, a receipt shall be obtained for such insured mail matter, showing to whom and when the same was delivered, which receipt shall be returned to the sender, and be received in the courts as prima facie evidence of such delivery: *Provided further*, That upon payment of the additional sum of 20 cents at the time of mailing by the sender of an insured article of mail matter, a receipt shall be obtained for such insured mail matter, showing to whom, when, and the address where the same was delivered, which receipt shall be returned to the sender, and be received in the courts as prima facie evidence of such delivery."

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, line 9, after the word "delivery," insert a colon and the following:

"*Provided further*, That upon payment of the additional sum of 20 cents at the time of mailing, a receipt shall be obtained for any registered mail matter, showing to whom, when, and the address where the same was delivered, which receipt shall be returned to the sender, and be received in the courts as prima facie evidence of such delivery."

On page 3, line 4, after the word "delivery," insert a colon and the following:

"*Provided further*, That upon payment of the additional sum of 20 cents at the time of mailing by the sender of an insured article of mail matter, a receipt shall be obtained for such insured mail matter, showing to whom, when, and the address where the same was delivered, which receipt shall be returned to the sender, and be received in the courts as prima facie evidence of such delivery."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Postmaster General to collect an increased charge for return receipts for domestic registered and insured mail when such receipts are requested after the mailing of the articles, and for other purposes."

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. In the event no member of the committee seeks recognition in control of the time in opposition to the bill, I want to claim such time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will inquire whether there is any member of the committee in opposition to the bill; if not, the Chair will recognize a member of the Committee of the Whole in opposition to the bill.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition in opposition to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SANDERS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY].

Mr. KELLY. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the Post Office Committee of the House has felt some responsibility as to making such corrections in postage rates and service rates as were justifiable in order to raise the revenues which are needed in the conduct of the Postal Service. We have reported a number of measures that have been given the most careful consideration possible, and this is one of them.

This bill deals with registered and insured mail, in both of which there is a loss of a large sum. The Post Office Department called the attention of the committee to the fact that the mail user in mailing the registered letter or article asks for a receipt from the addressee and pays 3 cents. However, the mail user sometimes does not pay the 3 cents but has the article registered, and afterwards comes in and asks if it was delivered. It was believed that it would be proper to fix a charge for the subsequent inquiry, which is really unnecessary, because the payment of 3 cents would get the card back with the signature of the addressee. So it is provided that a 5-cent rate shall be charged where the person mails a registered letter or package and afterwards desires the receipt card. It is believed that this will work no hardship on anyone but will be an added service.

Now where it is desirable to get the forwarding address for the mail sender there is a special fee of 20 cents—a high rate, but one, it was believed by the committee, the mail users would be willing to pay.

There is no addition as far as proof of delivery is concerned. At the present time the law provides that a fee

for which 3 cents is charged shall be prima facie evidence in court of the delivery. It is believed that this new service will raise a considerable sum of money. The Post Office Department can not estimate definitely, but it is suggested that it may amount to around \$2,000,000.

Mr. JONES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY. I yield.

Mr. JONES. I notice here the provision that the receipt shall be received in the court as prima facie evidence.

Mr. KELLY. Yes; the present law reads as follows:

SEC. 3928. Whenever the sender shall so request, and upon payment of a fee of 3 cents, a receipt shall be taken on the delivery of any registered mail matter, showing to whom and when the same was delivered, which receipt shall be returned to the sender, and be received in the courts as prima facie evidence of such delivery.

So, that there is no change as far as that is concerned.

Mr. JONES. Does that apply to all letters?

Mr. KELLY. No; it only applies to receipt cards of registered mail matter.

Mr. TILSON. What about the paragraph following the provision that the gentleman has just read?

Mr. KELLY. That is an amendment to the bill.

Mr. TILSON. That is an addition.

Mr. KELLY. Yes; that is an amendment added by the committee.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. There is no 5-cent fee now?

Mr. KELLY. No.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. Then the committee has not complied with the rule to put that in italics.

Mr. KELLY. That is in the report.

Mr. PATTERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY. I yield.

Mr. PATTERSON. The gentleman has no defense for this measure except that the Postmaster General wants it to raise revenue—it is a revenue-raising measure?

Mr. KELLY. I would not say that the Postmaster General is in favor of the 20-cent fee. He did recommend the 5-cent fee. The committee added the 20-cent fee.

Mr. PATTERSON. Then this is the committee's plan?

Mr. KELLY. Yes; the committee has added that.

Mr. PATTERSON. Then it is not for the service of the people but is a measure for raising revenue?

Mr. KELLY. I think no mail user is opposed to the fee. It will not be paid except by those who desire the service and believe it worth the price.

Mr. PATTERSON. But you say that the receipt shall be prima facie evidence in the court?

Mr. KELLY. I think the gentleman does not understand what I said a moment ago.

Mr. PATTERSON. I understand about that address feature. I have read the bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman take us into the confidence of the committee and tell us how the committee arrived at the 20 cents as a reasonable charge for this service? Did the committee have the services of an accountant or is the figure merely a guess?

Mr. KELLY. That was the result of the meeting of minds. The Post Office officials knew that we desired to have such a service inaugurated. Some witnesses came before the committee and said that they would pay more than 20 cents. Others insisted that it be 10 cents. Finally, in conference with Post Office officials, when they learned that we were going to put in this provision, the sum of 20 cents was arrived at as the rate that would produce the greatest amount of revenue.

Mr. STAFFORD. Did any member of the Post Office Department charged with the responsibility recommend the rate of 20 cents?

Mr. KELLY. The matter was originated in the committee, and when the Post Office Department learned that we intended to put such a provision in, then, in a conference, the rate was fixed at 20 cents.

Mr. STAFFORD. I reiterate the question: Did any member of the Post Office Department recommend the rate of 20 cents for this additional service?

Mr. KELLY. I could not put the responsibility on them, because this originated in the committee.

Mr. STAFFORD. Did any member of the Post Office Department recommend any definite rate whatsoever for this service; and if so, what was the rate?

Mr. KELLY. I have said they did not recommend this provision.

The Post Office Committee takes responsibility for the idea itself. The rate was agreed on at a conference between the Post Office Committee and the Post Office Department.

Mr. STAFFORD. Even if the Post Office Committee originated the idea I can still conceive how some member of the Post Office Department may have been asked to suggest a reasonable rate for that character of service, and for the fourth time I ask whether any member of the Post Office Department made any recommendation whatever as to the reasonableness of the rate of 20 cents.

Mr. KELLY. I have told the gentleman that there is no responsibility on the Post Office Department, and the Post Office Committee takes the responsibility and the credit, if any there be.

Mr. SLOAN. As a matter of practical effect, in reference to this prima facie evidence, does that apply to the State as well as to the Federal courts, or is it intended to impress it upon the State courts? Will it apply only to the State courts?

Mr. KELLY. The gentleman is more of an authority on legal procedure than I am. This feature has been in force for many years.

Mr. SLOAN. What is the purpose and what has the effect been? These little matters do not often get into the Federal courts. The establishment of facts is usually in the State courts as a rule. I thought the gentleman might have some practical suggestion.

Mr. KELLY. For many years these receipt cards have been accepted in the courts as prima facie evidence of the delivery of a registered letter or article.

Mr. SLOAN. In the State as well as in the Federal courts?

Mr. KELLY. I understand so; yes.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY. Yes.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. A few days ago I received a letter, as I suppose every Member of Congress did, containing an offer to send six neckties. Let us suppose they were sent by registered mail, and that then my secretary signed a receipt for them. I know nothing about it. Then I suppose they could go into court and prove the delivery by presenting a receipt and hold me liable for the six neckties.

Mr. KELLY. Oh, the gentleman is mistaken about the purpose of this provision. Of course, they can not make the gentleman pay for articles that he never ordered, even though they were delivered. We had that practice up for consideration for many months.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Just look at this, gentlemen. On the payment of 20 cents we will send out an investigator to find out when it was delivered, where it was delivered, and to whom it was delivered. Are you going to put the Post Office Department into the detective business?

Mr. KELLY. It requires no investigator. The gentleman knows that this only applies to forwarding addresses, where a man moves away from an address previously given. The registered letter is forwarded on and the employee of the post office writes in the address where delivery is made.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. It says that upon the payment of an additional sum of 20 cents at the time of mailing a receipt shall be obtained for any registered mail matter showing to whom it went, and the address where the same was delivered, and the receipt shall be returned to the sender.

Mr. KELLY. The gentleman will agree that now the receipt card shows to whom the registered letter has been delivered. The signature and time of delivery has been on these cards for many years. The address of delivery is the new feature.

Mr. MICHENER. Is it not true that this matter originated possibly from collectors of bills, and they are perfectly

willing to pay any kind of a price to find the location of certain debtors?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. That is exactly what I am saying.

Mr. MICHENER. To-day, as a matter of fact, you can send a letter. The letter possibly never comes back, but it goes to a forwarding address, and the postal authorities are prohibited from giving to the sender the forwarding address. If this legislation goes through, you will be able to locate the forwarding address of any person. That is all there is to it.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. For 20 cents, and that is exactly what I said.

Mr. MICHENER. Yes.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. It is using the Post Office Department as an investigating bureau.

Mr. STAFFORD. As an aid to the collection agencies and shyster lawyers.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. May I ask the gentleman the necessity for the amendment on page 3 and almost the same on page 2? What is the difference between the two provisos, and why must it be repeated?

Mr. KELLY. One applies to registered mail, and the other to insured mail. As far as the collecting agency proposition is concerned, we had before our committee representatives of a great many business organizations that without doubt would find it a benefit. We also had statements from library associations that portrayed a situation where they send books out and the person receiving them may have moved away.

It is then impossible to get the address of the person and get the book back. Public libraries find it necessary frequently to send out what they call overdue notices, when books have not been returned on time, and it also frequently happens that the persons to whom these notices have been sent have moved, so that the record of the residence on file at the public library is incorrect. This has caused a great deal of petty annoyance and additional clerical work. If a letter carrier in delivering the registered notices would place on the return slip the address to which the notice was delivered, this annoyance would be eliminated. The statement further says that all public libraries are undermanned, and this additional service on the part of the Postal Service would help to relieve some vexatious situations. It would apply to many such cases as that. We believe there is nothing hidden about the proposition. It only applies to services actually given. No man should be afraid of having his address known. I can not conceive that any honest man would object to having his address known, and that is the information given in this receipt.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I agree with the gentleman that every honest man should have his address known, but I do not want to put the Post Office Department in the business of locating crooks.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. Under the very excellent administration of the Hon. Albert Sidney Burleson, when the Post Office Department paid its own way, you could, for 10 cents, have a letter or package registered and also could get a return receipt on a registered letter or package.

Mr. KELLY. It never was 10 cents.

Mr. BLANTON. Ten cents is what it was under the Burleson administration. Then it was raised to 15 cents, with 3 cents extra for a return card.

Mr. KELLY. The gentleman is talking about the fee.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes. For 10 cents you could then have a letter registered and get a return receipt. It was then raised to 15 cents and then to 18 cents to get a return card. Why could they not, on the return card, which is printed, have a place for the addressee's address, and when he acknowledges receipt of the letter he will sign his name and put in his address, and there is no necessity to charge an extra 20 cents?

Mr. KELLY. But if the mail users are willing to pay 20 cents for it—

Mr. BLANTON. Ah, but the real mail users are not willing to pay it, for they are the poor farmers and the poor

workingmen all over the United States. They are the ones who send registered letters just as well as the business men of the country.

Mr. KELLY. The individual mail user does not need this service.

Mr. BLANTON. But the people out in the country everywhere are sending registered letters every day, and they want their return receipts, and they want the addresses sometimes. Why charge them 20 cents when we are charging them now 8 cents more than we used to charge them or should charge them?

Mr. KELLY. It is an endeavor to raise a little money for the post-office establishment.

Mr. BLANTON. I am surprised that the gentleman from Pennsylvania would do it at the expense of 120,000,000 people of the United States.

Mr. KELLY. The gentleman is mistaken. This will only be used, I will say to my friend, by large concerns, by libraries, which send out many books, and companies which have great lists for registered mail, the department stores who send out packages, and so forth, and they should pay a reasonable fee for this service. It is an optional service.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. The gentleman has another bill for directory service. That is in addition to this?

Mr. KELLY. That is an entirely different proposition.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. But that is also for the benefit of these mail users.

Mr. KELLY. Of course, if this committee does not desire to assist in raising any money whatever for the Postal Service; all that is necessary is to kill these bills and I will not shed a tear. The committee can destroy out all these efforts of ours to raise a little revenue with these bills. We have provided for raising five or six millions dollars, and that without injuring the service. If in the judgment of the committee it is not desirable to follow such a policy, let us kill these bills and be done with it.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Does the gentleman believe that we will make any money in giving directory service, in collecting long mailing lists of thousands and thousands of names at the rate provided for in this bill?

Mr. KELLY. This 20-cent rate?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. No; the other bill.

Mr. KELLY. That is another bill. Let us take that up when we reach it. This bill will raise, I believe, about \$2,000,000 in addition to what is now being raised.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. KELLY. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. Is there not a proper revenue-raising committee in the House that has made a study of raising all revenues for the Government? Why should not the Ways and Means Committee look after the question of raising revenue for the Government?

Mr. KELLY. In general, I do not know that the gentleman and I are very far apart; but I am in favor, where we can raise additional revenues without injuring the service, of doing it. The Post Office Committee has that responsibility, and we have the bills here to do it.

Mr. SLOAN. And make the department pay its way?

Mr. KELLY. As nearly as possible without curtailing proper service.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY. I yield.

Mr. STAFFORD. I would like to inquire, in all candor, whether the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads has made inquiry as to the need of increasing the rates of postage on parcel-post matter? Parcel-post carriage in the first zone, since it was established, has been regarded as grossly unremunerative to the Government. Its benefits are obtained by merchandising houses of the country. I repeat, has the gentleman's committee given any consideration to revising the parcel-post rates where it is acknowledged we are carrying mail below compensatory rates and where, if it were raised to a proper rate, there would be obtained not only a few hundred thousand dollars but millions of dollars?

Mr. KELLY. That has not been neglected at all. Under the law the Postmaster General has the authority and is actually required to have the Interstate Commerce Commission establish rates which will make parcel post self-sustaining. That action was not taken from the establishment of the parcel post in 1913 down to 1930.

However, at the present time the Postmaster General has before the Interstate Commerce Commission a request under that law, stating that in the first three zones there are losses on the rates, and in some of the wider zones there is a gain, and asking for an adjustment. I have information that that adjustment will be ordered in due time by the Interstate Commerce Commission and a substantial addition to revenue will be received as a result. So that matter has been looked after. We are endeavoring to properly adjust rates in all the ways possible.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am much inclined to support the gentleman's measure, but before I do so, I want to see if I fully understand the practical purposes of this bill.

As I understand from statements made, the gentleman does not propose any change whatever in the existing postal regulations with reference to the amount of the charges for registered mail matter, where a return receipt is requested at the time of the initial mailing?

Mr. KELLY. No. It is exactly the same as at present.

Mr. BANKHEAD. But the gentleman does say that numerous instances arise where, if a man has waived his privilege of requesting a return receipt, he desires after that to send a tracer, so to speak, to determine whether or not that package was delivered, and if he desires to incur that additional and entirely optional privilege, it is provided in this bill that he shall pay the Government 20 cents for making that inquiry?

Mr. KELLY. Five cents for the regular receipt, and if he desires the forwarding address, 20 cents. That is all there is to it. It is an optional service. It will be paid by those who believe it is a fair charge, but it in no way affects the charges of present facilities.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I doubt whether any of these other bills on the committee's calendar ought to pass. I do not see any necessity for them. Every one of these bills places an additional burden upon the people who use the Postal Service of the United States. I can not see where it is necessary to charge the people of the United States 5 cents for directory service on each letter that is sent with 2 cents postage on it. That is a bill which is coming up right after the one that is now under consideration.

The business men all over my section of the country have been against that bill ever since it was first proposed in this House. They are still against it, and it is not a wise measure. If we need more revenue for the Postal Service, let it come out of the general revenues of the Government. There are certain features of the Postal Service which are not self-sustaining. It has always been the policy of the Congress to provide whatever extra was necessary out of the general revenues of the Government by granting the Post Office Department whatever appropriations it needs to meet its running expenses.

We have our Ways and Means Committee that has been enlightened through years of study on the question of raising revenue. It is a much better committee to raise revenue for the country than this Post Office Committee. It has all the facts and statistics of the country before it. It knows how to raise it, and I am more willing for that committee to raise the revenue of the country than the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

This directory service bill is a bill which is going to make itself felt as an added burden upon every citizen of the United States. A person who lives in the country mails a letter to some acquaintance who lives in a city. That person does not know the exact address many times, and it

causes very little trouble and expense to the post office in that city to give it directory service. The distributing mail clerk in the post office knows the address of practically 75 per cent of the people of the city already and he can distribute it without giving it directory service. The people are entitled to that service without extra charge, and to charge them 5 cents additional would be a postal rate of 7 cents on every letter. That service is now given for 2 cents and ought to be continued to be rendered for 2 cents, and if it should cost a little to give that service, the cost should be paid out of the general revenues of the Government.

Now, this 20 cents extra charge for getting the address of a party to whom registered mail is delivered is wholly unnecessary. The department, when it prints the return card, could have the address of the addressee in it and the party receiving the registered letter or registered package could just as well write in his address at the time he receives it. Such procedure would not cost the Government an added penny. I can not see why that service could not be rendered for the 18 cents we now charge. Up until the time Postmaster General Burleson went out of office there had never been charged more than 10 cents for a registered letter, which also covered the cost of a return receipt. We have increased the rate since the Burleson régime from 10 cents to 18 cents, and now they want to charge an additional 20 cents for getting information for the sender. I do not believe it is wise legislation, with all due respect to this committee. I think that the committee, when it passed the first bill which it brought in here to-day, should have called it a day, stopped at that good work, and not brought in all of this unwise chicken feed which will place an added burden upon the people of this country.

I would like for the gentleman from Pennsylvania to rise in his seat and tell us one single policy which Postmaster General Brown has promulgated during his régime which has been of any benefit to the people of the United States. I have not found a policy of his that has benefited a single constituent in my country. He has closed up post office after post office in the State of Texas. He has changed postal route after postal route, to the detriment of the people who live in the country, and he has done that over the protest of many constituents of mine. I do not know of a policy which he has inaugurated that has been beneficial to the people. Every single proposal he has made to this Congress has been an added burden upon the shoulders of the already overburdened people of the United States.

That is all I have to say about it. [Applause.]

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of obtaining information as to the additional information that will be secured on registered packages upon the payment of the additional fee of 20 cents. As I understand it, to-day anyone upon paying a fee of 3 cents at the time of mailing will be accorded the right of a return card showing to whom and when the registered letter or registered package was delivered. Now you are proposing that an additional fee of 20 cents shall be paid, at the request of the sender, for some character of service. Will the gentleman inform the committee what additional service the Government is going to furnish for that additional 20 cents, other than what is received upon the return card showing the name and the time when the registered article was delivered?

Mr. KELLY. At the present time, as the gentleman knows, for the 3-cent fee the mail user can have a return receipt showing the signature of the addressee and the time of delivery. By the payment of 20 cents addition, as provided in this bill, he will also receive on that card the final address to which the mail was forwarded, so that he will have information as to the present address of the addressee.

Mr. STAFFORD. That causes me to submit to the attention of the committee a situation which very likely has been called to the attention of all the members, off and on, and that is the policy of certain merchandising houses of sending merchandise to certain people throughout the country without the request of the person to whom it is sent. That

policy has arisen by reason of a great abuse of the Postal Service. Certain large merchandising houses or individuals will deliberately send to you and send to large numbers of the people of the country merchandise which has never been ordered. They are the illegitimate mail-order houses of the country.

They put the burden or the onus upon the person to whom the merchandise is delivered of paying the postage in many instances to return it or else if they keep it they are liable to be charged with the payment of the reasonable value of the article.

Now, I have a suspicion, ladies and gentlemen of the committee, that the real purpose of this 20-cent fee is to improve the practices of what I call these illegitimate mail-order concerns that are sending out merchandise without the request of the addressee, and seeking to impose upon him the purchase of the article unless he returns it.

Mr. KELLY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. KELLY. I want to state, in all fairness, that this measure, of course, can have no connection whatever with firms sending out material which has never been ordered, and the giving of the address of the addressee would be of no aid to such a firm.

Mr. STAFFORD. I can see where it would have a direct pertinency in aiding such an individual. Let us be frank about this. Everyone of us from time to time has received publications and other merchandise which we have never ordered with the request that we return it, and we are obliged sometimes to even pay the postage in order to return it. If we keep it we are obliged to pay for it. Do we want to aid in that kind of practice by allowing these mail-order houses the privilege of knowing the exact address by paying a fee of 20 cents, in order to begin a lawsuit and perhaps have evidence to produce in the court, so that unless the book or the merchandise is returned we will be brought into a justice-of-the-peace court to pay the full value of the article which the original sender has charged?

Mr. DICKSTEIN and Mr. HOGG of Indiana rose.

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from New York, who was first on his feet.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. In the last few months there have been quite a number of cases where persons have received articles that they never ordered.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is what I am complaining about. Mr. DICKSTEIN. How is that connected with this 20-cent fee?

Mr. STAFFORD. I am saying that it will aid a person who is engaged in such a nefarious practice. Constituents of mine have written to me during the last term and have asked me to use my best efforts to stop this practice, which has become a grave abuse. If they did not return the merchandise, then these houses would be furnished with evidence to compel them to pay its value. If this 20-cent fee is not going to redound to the benefit of such illegitimate practitioners, I want to know why. I now yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HOGG of Indiana. Will the gentleman be good enough to tell the House just what he did when he received that unsolicited merchandise?

Mr. STAFFORD. What I did with it? I put it in the mail and returned it.

Mr. HOGG of Indiana. The gentleman was under no obligation whatever to do anything with it.

Mr. STAFFORD. No; but if I had retained it and the sender had proved by a 20-cent return card that I had received it, he could have given the evidence to some cheap, shyster attorney—and there are plenty of them throughout the country—to bring an action against me for its full value. There are many instances where persons have refused this kind of merchandise who have never ordered it, and I have served on the Post Office Committee long enough to know that the mail-order houses are only desirous of trying to use the Postal Service to improve their own practices.

Mr. HOGG of Indiana. Does not the gentleman believe that simply receiving the article implies no obligation on the part of the addressee to pay for it?

Mr. STAFFORD. If the person who sends it can prove that the addressee has opened and retained it, there is a legal obligation to pay a quantum valuit for that book or other merchandise.

Mr. HOGG of Indiana. But there is no legal obligation.

Mr. BOX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BOX. This measure is presented as a revenue measure. It requires some additional service on the part of the Post Office Department. Has the gentleman been able to ascertain what additional cost this will impose on the department in order to obtain and furnish the information requested to the person mailing the package?

Mr. STAFFORD. I was very solicitous in the three questions I put to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who has charge of the bill, as to how the committee arrived at the 20-cent fee. He said it was an idea—I will not say a caprice, I will not say a whim, but an idea—of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. I then asked the gentleman whether any accountant of the Post Office Service was called upon to fix what he regarded as a reasonable fee, and the gentleman said no, that it was just a conclusion of the committee.

I am not opposed to this 5-cent fee that is recommended where a person sends registered mail in the ordinary course and fails to ask for a return card, and then later wants to have the return card service. I am not opposed to that 5-cent fee. I think 5 cents would be a reasonable fee for such a service, but I am skeptical, indeed, as to the real reason for this 20-cent fee. The department does not recommend it. It is an idea, and it may be a flighty idea, or it may be a sound idea, in deference to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Mr. GLOVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. GLOVER. With reference to these packages the gentleman has spoken of that are frequently sent through the mails to individuals who have not ordered them, is it not also true that they frequently fix a date upon which you are to return them, and if they got this receipt, then they could go after you if you did not return it within that time.

Mr. STAFFORD. All of us will recall that almost all of them have a certain definite statement on the label stating you are supposed to return it within a certain, definite time. Many people are imposed upon by this kind of practice. I do not want to have the Government a party in aiding them to carry on such practices.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Michigan rise?

Mr. MAPES. To ask the chairman of the committee or the gentleman in charge of the bill a question.

Mr. KELLY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MAPES. A colleague of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. WATSON, has introduced a bill which would prohibit the sending through the mail of unsolicited merchandise, which practice, in some places, has become a great nuisance. My understanding is that the Post Office Department recommends the passage of such legislation, and I would like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania, or any other member of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, if there is any prospect of that bill being reported out of the committee in the near future?

Mr. KELLY. I will say in answer to the gentleman from Michigan that that matter has been given most extensive attention by the Post Office Committee. Two hearings taking several days have been held within the last four years. The committee desired to deal with an admitted evil and went into it with that purpose in view. Members of Congress appeared on both sides of the question. We finally decided that it is impossible at the present time to write a law which will not do a grave injustice to innocent parties, representa-

tives of charitable organizations, religious organizations, and those who send out stamps for tuberculosis leagues, those seeking to raise funds for churches by souvenir postal cards, and so forth. It is impossible under our present state of knowledge to write a bill which will deal properly with the merchandise proposition alone, and therefore, as far as this session of Congress is concerned, I can not lend much encouragement to the hope that such a bill will be brought out. However, it will probably be taken up again in the next Congress in an effort to deal with the question.

Mr. MAPES. It is true, is it not, that the department has recommended some such legislation?

Mr. KELLY. The department recommended a measure which would have been impracticable.

Mr. MAPES. And it is also true, is it not, that this privilege of sending unsolicited merchandise through the mail has become a great nuisance in a great many parts of the country?

Mr. KELLY. I think it is a decided nuisance, and if it can be prevented it should be.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. Does the gentleman think it is wise for the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads to permit preachers in Connecticut, Texas, Nebraska, or Oregon to write Members of Congress from other States soliciting subscriptions for their particular church? Did the committee have that in mind in refusing, after four years' consideration, to not report the Watson bill?

Mr. KELLY. The bill referred to does not deal with that question. It deals with sending out Christmas cards without an order and asking the addressee to pay for them or send the cards back.

Mr. BLANTON. The committee has had four years on this Watson bill, and will it take four years more to prepare and draft a bill?

Mr. MAPES. I want to say to the gentleman that, so far as I am concerned as one Member of the House, I hope the committee will be able to work out some satisfactory legislation which will prevent this practice and abuse of the mails.

Mr. HOUSTON of Delaware. Why is it that a limit of time is fixed for mailing the package but no provision is made under the 20-cent fee?

Mr. KELLY. That special receipt card is for the purpose only of getting the final address of the addressee.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. How long after the package has been mailed has the sender the right to get this address?

Mr. KELLY. Subsequent to the mailing of the package by the payment of the 5-cent fee he can get the receipt card back.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. There ought to be some time limit in which he can call for the information.

Mr. KELLY. That will be regulated by the Post Office Department, as it does at present on the ordinary receipts.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY. I yield.

Mr. SABATH. I want to ask the gentleman a question: I received a communication from a gentleman whom I have known for many years, inclosing a pamphlet, which I think is more detrimental to the public than the receiving of merchandise that is not ordered. I want to know whether the funds that would be derived from the increase of these fees would help the department in enforcing and precluding from our mail the fraudulent, racketeering pamphlets sent out by the unscrupulous agencies, by brokers, or Wall Street vultures like the one I just received, and portions of which I will now read:

MARKET'S REACTION PROVES PROFITABLE FOR PROFESSIONAL TRADING

Trading on the short side of American Waterworks again results in profit making by—

I will omit the name so as not to advertise these schemers—participants of syndicate profit through trade.

The short position which was taken on November 18 was entirely justified, as events proved.

Now, there are hundreds of such parasitical agencies throughout the United States who use the mails for the purpose of robbing unsuspecting and honest people by putting out such literature, which is fraudulent, and should be stopped. Have the post office authorities the power to stop it under the law now or will it require additional legislation to preclude these racketeers from robbing thousands and thousands of innocent men who are victimized by their alluring publicity to the effect that tremendous sums of money can be made by selling short on the stock exchange? This letter was received only five or ten minutes ago from a man who for 20 years has had experience on the board of trade and the stock exchange and well recognizes this infamous practice.

Mr. KELLY. I will say in answer to the gentleman that I am in agreement with him in criticizing selling short on the stock exchange. However, this particular bill does not deal with anything of that kind.

Mr. SABATH. I know that; I did not ask the gentleman whether this particular legislation would do it, but whether the post-office authorities had the power to stop this abuse, as millions of pieces of similar literature are sent by these parasites to the people in all sections of our country to lead them with the deliberate and vicious intent to mulct them out of their savings.

Mr. KELLY. There is abundant legislation on the statute books, and has been for years, to deal with any fraudulent company in the United States.

Mr. SABATH. Then, why does not the Post Office Department stop this practice? Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to embody this pamphlet in my remarks.

Mr. SPROUL of Illinois. I object to the pamphlet being printed, but not to the extension of the gentleman's own remarks.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. The gentleman from Illinois does not want to use the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to advertise this, does he?

Mr. SABATH. Indeed not. What I want is to put a stop to these schemers, preying upon the public.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by the insertion of this pamphlet.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. SPROUL of Illinois. I object.

Mr. KELLY. Let me say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] that if he will on his own responsibility as a Member of Congress send that pamphlet to the Post Office Department, declaring it, in his estimation, to be a fraudulent enterprise, I promise him that an inspector will be sent out to investigate; and if it is found to be fraudulent, it will be barred from the mails. Of course, it must be proven to be a fraud.

Mr. SABATH. That is a splendid position which the gentleman takes, much more so than the position taken by my colleague from Illinois [Mr. SPROUL]. Whenever I try to stop these corrupt practices or these infamous gamblers, somehow or other, somewhere, either I am denied further time or an objection is raised preventing me from familiarizing the country with these practices. This is but one of the many similar agencies guilty of using the mails to defraud, and I exceedingly regret that objection has been raised to embody this pamphlet in the RECORD, so that the House may be informed as to the abuses permitted by the post-office authorities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] has expired. There being no further time desired in general debate, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3928 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by section 210 of Title II of an act entitled "An act reclassifying the salaries of postmasters and employees of the Postal Service, readjusting their salaries and compensation on an equitable basis, increasing postal rates to provide for such readjustment, and for other purposes," approved February 28, 1925 (43 Stat. 1068; U. S. C., title 39, sec. 386), is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 3928. Whenever the sender shall so request, and upon payment of a fee of 3 cents at the time of mailing or of 5 cents

subsequent to the time of mailing, a receipt shall be obtained for any registered mail matter, showing to whom and when the same was delivered, which receipt shall be returned to the sender, and be received in the courts as prima facie evidence of such delivery."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 9, after the word "delivery," insert:

"Provided further, That upon payment of the additional sum of 20 cents at the time of mailing by the sender of an insured article of mail matter, a receipt shall be obtained for such insured mail matter, showing to whom, when, and the address where the same was delivered, which receipt shall be returned to the sender, and be received in the courts as prima facie evidence of such delivery."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 2. Paragraph (a) of section 211 of Title II of an act entitled "An act reclassifying the salaries of postmasters and employees of the Postal Service, readjusting their salaries and compensation on an equitable basis, increasing postal rates to provide for such readjustment, and for other purposes," approved February 28, 1925 (43 Stat. 1069; U. S. C., title 39, sec. 245), is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 211. (a) The fee for insurance shall be 5 cents for indemnification not to exceed \$5; 8 cents for indemnification not to exceed \$25; 10 cents for indemnification not to exceed \$50; and 25 cents for indemnification not to exceed \$100. Whenever the sender of an insured article of mail matter shall so request, and upon payment of a fee of 3 cents at the time of mailing, or of 5 cents subsequent to the time of mailing, a receipt shall be obtained for such insured mail matter, showing to whom and when the same was delivered, which receipt shall be returned to the sender, and be received in the courts as prima facie evidence of such delivery."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 3, line 8, after the word "delivery," insert: "Provided, further, That upon payment of the additional sum of 20 cents at the time of mailing, a receipt shall be obtained for any registered mail matter, showing to whom, when, and the address where the same was delivered, which receipt shall be returned to the sender, and be received in the courts as prima facie evidence of such delivery."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GLOVER) there were—ayes 47, noes 7.

So the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SANDERS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HOCH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 8649 and had directed him to report the same back with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to, and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. SANDERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? [After a pause.] If not, the Chair will put them en gros. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

THE 44-HOUR BILL FOR THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD upon the 44-hour bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, in the present unemployment crisis the post office is not only doing nothing toward setting an example for other employers by giving work to needy men, but is juggling the tours of duty of regular employees so as to prevent the employment of the regular substitute employees.

The 44-hour week bill will go a long step toward correcting the situation so far as employment in the Postal Service is concerned. It is also necessary for the proper, efficient handling of the mails. The Government should be the leader in progressive movements to improve working conditions, so as to serve as a model for private business to follow. In this case the 44-hour week has been general in private industry for many years, and the Government should at least bring itself into conformity with this practice.

It is learned from reliable sources that at least 40 vacancies in the regular clerical and carrier forces exist at this time in the St. Paul post office, and apparently there is nothing being done to fill these positions. There are regular tours that have been vacated by the retirements, deaths, or resignations of clerks and carriers. As each vacancy occurred the work has been spread out among the other employees who are now driven at top speed under threat of penalties leading to demotion or dismissal.

In order to avoid the employment of auxiliary clerks at the hours of heaviest mails and on heavy days such as the first of the month, the tours of duty of the regular clerks are set back and changed frequently to meet changing conditions. This means that veteran clerks with many years' service are shunted back to later hours and have their regular habits as to meals and sleep interfered with to the detriment of health.

The policy of not filling vacancies is laid at the door of the Post Office Department administration at Washington. This is a national policy, and a survey made by reliable sources shows that there are 5,000 vacancies that should be filled for the efficient as well as humane administration of the Postal Service.

The President, the Congress, and every right-thinking person is urging the necessity of regular employment, the maintaining of wages, and the urgency of buying. Unemployed substitute postal employees can not buy. The postmaster who thus contrives to keep them unemployed is sadly out of step with the administration of which he is presumably a representative.

EXPEDITIOUS HANDLING OF CERTAIN MAIL

Mr. SANDERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 10676) to restrict the expeditious handling, transportation, and delivery of certain mail matter where local contractual conditions are inadequate.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York calls up the bill H. R. 10676, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

Mr. SANDERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The bill is on the Union Calendar. The House, therefore, will automatically resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOCH] will take the chair.

The House accordingly resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 10676, with Mr. HOCH in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute be read in lieu of the original bill and that it be considered by paragraphs.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that the committee amendment be con-

sidered in lieu of the original bill for the purpose of amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the committee amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That the Postmaster General is authorized to provide and issue special-delivery and special-handling stamps of such denominations as he may consider necessary.

"Sec. 2. To procure the most expeditious handling and transportation practicable and the immediate delivery of mail matter at the office of address special-delivery stamps shall be affixed thereto, in addition to the regular postage, in accordance with the following schedule: Matter weighing not more than 2 pounds, if of the first class, 10 cents, if of any other class, 15 cents; matter weighing more than 2 but not more than 10 pounds, if of the first class, 20 cents, if of any other class, 25 cents; matter weighing more than 10 pounds, if of the first class, 25 cents, if of any other class, 35 cents: *Provided*, That, under such regulations as the Postmaster General may prescribe, ordinary postage stamps of equivalent value may be accepted in lieu of the special-delivery stamps herein specified.

"Sec. 3. For making special delivery there may be paid to the messenger or other person making such delivery 9 cents, for matter of the first class weighing not in excess of 2 pounds, 10 cents for matter of other than the first class weighing not in excess of 2 pounds, 15 cents for mail matter of any class weighing more than 2 pounds but not in excess of 10 pounds, and 20 cents for mail matter of any class weighing in excess of 10 pounds.

"Sec. 4. To procure the most expeditious handling and transportation practicable of mail matter of the fourth class, special-handling stamps shall be affixed thereto, in addition to the regular postage, in accordance with the following schedule: Matter weighing not more than 2 pounds, 10 cents; matter weighing more than 2 but not more than 10 pounds, 15 cents; matter weighing more than 10 pounds, 20 cents: *Provided*, That, under such regulations as the Postmaster General may prescribe, ordinary postage stamps of equivalent value may be accepted in lieu of the special-handling stamps herein specified.

"Sec. 5. Section 212, Title II, of the act of February 28, 1925, reclassifying the salaries of postmasters and employees of the Postal Service, readjusting their salaries and compensation on an equitable basis, increasing postal rates to provide for such readjustment, and for other purposes (43 Stat. 1069; U. S. C., title 39, secs. 166, 170), and so much of section 207 of Title II of said act as relates to the expeditious handling, transportation, and delivery of mail matter of the fourth class (43 Stat. 1067; U. S. C., title 39, sec. 294), as amended (sec. 8, act of May 29, 1928; 45 Stat. 943, 944; U. S. C., Supp. III, title 39, secs. 166, 294), and all acts and parts of acts inconsistent herewith are hereby repealed."

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order against the bill for the purpose of securing some information. Does this bill conform to the Ramseyer rule with reference to amendment to existing law?

Mr. KELLY. Yes. That is met most thoroughly in the report. We have covered it in several ways, and Mr. LA-GUARDIA, who is an expert on that subject, agrees with me in that statement.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

Mr. KELLY. There is nothing in this bill that need worry anyone. All that is provided is to reenact the present law as to special-delivery and special-handling services, with the exception that it covers those cases where first-class service can not be given to fourth-class matter.

In the act of 1925 we created a new service. That service was called special handling, and we provided that any mail matter bearing a stamp of 25 cents would get the same expeditious handling and transportation as is given to first-class matter. That was a service which we hoped would develop considerable patronage and did result in a great deal of support.

However, with the change in transportation, which has already been called to our attention this afternoon, the taking off of trains between local points, we have reached a place where the present law can not be carried out. For instance, the usual parcel-post package that is put in a mail car and sent on a train is now taken past a local station, whereas the first-class mail is delivered by means of a closed pouch thrown off at the station. The parcel-post matter can not be thrown off at that station and the train does not stop.

So that it has become necessary, in order to have the actual practice conform to the law, to change the provision so that instead of making it compulsory that first-class service shall be given a parcel, if a special-handling stamp is

affixed, we provide that "wherever practicable" the Postmaster General shall give it the same treatment as is given first-class mail.

That is all that this bill seeks to do, to bring the actual present practice into line with the law. That will be done by the inclusion of the phrase "to provide the most expeditious handling and transportation practicable."

That is all there is to the law, and I feel certain that no Member will object to it.

Mr. BOYLAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY. I yield.

Mr. BOYLAN. Does this increase the rates in any manner?

Mr. KELLY. It does not. The rate is written exactly in this bill as under the present law.

Mr. STAFFORD. I rise for information. I notice by section 2 of the bill special rates are provided for special-delivery service "for immediate delivery at the office of address." I assume that that refers to delivery of special-delivery matter in all post offices?

Mr. KELLY. That has always been the purpose of special delivery, to expedite it after it reaches the office of address.

Mr. STAFFORD. Now, it is provided that in addition to the present rates of regular postage there shall be on a package weighing not more than two pounds 10 cents, and it is provided that for that special-delivery service the messenger shall receive 9 cents and the Government shall receive 1 cent. Does the gentleman believe there is any compensation whatsoever to the Government for the special service, where a charge of 10 cents is made on a small package for special-delivery service and 9 cents is paid to the special-delivery messenger?

Mr. KELLY. Well, that has been the law for years.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am not asking as to that. The question is not whether it has been the law. I am asking whether the gentleman believes there is any revenue to the Postal Service where we receive a package for special delivery with a postage of 10 cents, and 9 cents of that 10 cents is paid to the special-delivery messenger?

Mr. KELLY. The gentleman from Wisconsin understands, of course, that the regular postage is affixed as well as the special-delivery stamp. This is for the additional service only.

Mr. STAFFORD. I ask the gentleman again—I direct my inquiry to the character of the service, special delivery. For that service there is a charge of 10 cents, and there is paid to the special-delivery messenger 9 cents of the 10 cents.

Mr. KELLY. So that is 1 cent additional to the Government, for which no additional service is given, other than is performed by the special-delivery messenger.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does the gentleman think that is compensatory for the additional service given?

Mr. KELLY. I do.

Mr. STAFFORD. I must take issue with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, that 1 cent will compensate the Government for the special-delivery service performed in the special handling that is required.

Mr. KELLY. The gentleman from Wisconsin knows that the placing of the special-delivery stamp on the package does not impose a single additional cost upon the Government, except the cost of delivering it by special messenger.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman from Wisconsin knows that it does incur additional obligation upon the service to have that character of service. The gentleman from Wisconsin does know that the special-delivery service is a different character of service entirely, which requires the maintenance in our post offices of a special section for that character of service.

I do know, from my little knowledge of the Postal Service, that 1 cent is not compensatory for that additional service. The gentleman is prating about raising revenue, and here is a chance where the Postal Service could raise revenue, but they are frittering it away for the benefit of those commercial houses which want to use special-delivery service.

Mr. KELLY. My friend from Wisconsin knows that if we made such a change all we would do would be to take

pay away from some poor messenger boy, who needs every penny he now gets, and give it to the Government instead.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, the poor messenger boy! Some years back all of this service was performed by messenger boys, but now it is performed by men, and in many instances their salaries are compensatory. I have not examined their schedule of pay lately, but I know they maintain automobiles for this character of service, and they do get, in some instances, a very good wage for that service.

Mr. KELLY. Of course, they get no salary at all. All these messengers get are the fees, and for years we have given them 9 cents out of the 10 cents.

Mr. STAFFORD. They are no longer boys; they are men who are performing this service. The department is to be complimented for employing men and arranging it so that they do make a living wage.

Mr. KELLY. They get no salary at all; they get a fee only, and for years we have been giving them 9 cents out of the 10 cents. We ought to give them a living compensation. The additional 1 cent, in addition to the regular postage, fully compensates the Government for rendering this service. The regular postage covers the transportation of the article itself. I will also state to the gentleman that the boys are now compelled to furnish automobiles.

Mr. PATTERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY. Yes.

Mr. PATTERSON. What about section 5? How is that different from the law which is at present in force?

Mr. KELLY. There is no change there. This is simply for the purpose of dealing with the acts of 1925 and 1928, both of which deal with this special delivery and special handling charge.

Mr. PATTERSON. There is no change at all?

Mr. KELLY. There is no change at all.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further time requested in general debate, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The Clerk read the bill for amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the committee by way of substitute.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SANDERS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HOCH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 10676, had directed him to report the same back with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. SANDERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendment thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEE FOR INQUIRIES CONCERNING REGISTERED, INSURED, OR COLLECT-ON-DELIVERY MAIL, AND FOR POSTAL MONEY ORDERS

Mr. SANDERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 5659) to authorize the Postmaster General to charge a fee for inquiries made for patrons concerning registered, insured, or collect-on-delivery mail, and for postal money orders.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. SANDERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Accordingly the House automatically resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 5659, with Mr. HOCH in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 5659, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Postmaster General is authorized to provide by regulation for making such inquiries as he may consider proper concerning registered, insured, or collect-on-delivery mail upon the request of the sender or addressee thereof, or his agent, or concerning postal money orders upon request of the remitter, payee, indorsee, or his agent, and for the payment of such fees as he may prescribe for such service.

Mr. SANDERS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY] such time as he may require.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from New York rise?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, if no one else asks for time in opposition, I shall ask for such time, although I would prefer for some one else to ask it.

Mr. SANDERS of New York. I will yield the gentleman from New York all the time he may want.

Mr. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, this measure is an endeavor, in some degree, to bring up a little closer in relationship the revenues of certain special services and the cost of rendering such service.

There are decided losses in the services which are covered by this measure. For instance, I think we should take into consideration the fact that the Post Office Department reports that the registry service at the present time is giving us a loss of \$7,213,000 every year. On collect-on-delivery the loss is reported as \$4,225,000. On special delivery the loss is \$154,117. On money orders the loss is \$10,432,876. In other words, a great part of the so-called deficit of the Post Office Department is covered in the losses on certain special services.

This bill undertakes to provide a way by which a certain amount of revenue can be received through a charge for inquiries as to these special services after the services have been received by the mail user.

It is a practice in many of the large offices at the present time for firms, corporations, and individuals using the money-order system and the registry system and the collect-on-delivery service to refuse to pay the 3-cent fee which is demanded for a return receipt but instead to come into the office and inquire as to where that particular money order or where a particular registered package is, thus avoiding the payment of the 3 cents. This bill would permit a charge to be assessed, so that there will be a smaller number of such inquiries, which in most cases are entirely unnecessary.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY. I yield.

Mr. STAFFORD. I was under the impression we had made provision for that special service by charging a fee of 5 cents under the bill which we passed a little while ago.

Mr. KELLY. No; that is for the return card. That permits any one, subsequent to the time of mailing a registered letter, to get a receipt. This is where an inquiry is made without any payment whatever at present.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. That is, if the gentleman please, if an old lady mails a registered letter and then becomes anxious about not having received a reply, she goes to the postmaster and says, "I mailed a registered letter to my daughter," and the postmaster will say, "If you give me a nickel I will tell whether it was delivered or not." Is not that about what it amounts to?

Mr. KELLY. That is not the purpose of the bill. I would like to paint another picture for the gentleman. A huge corporation with plenty of funds to pay expenses makes the Post Office Department do its accounting business by fur-

nishing them a record of all the money orders, all the registered letters, and all the collect-on-delivery mail sent out without paying a cent for it.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. The gentleman has no limit to the charge to be made under the provisions of his bill?

Mr. KELLY. The bill as it stands leaves it to the Postmaster General, who will fix the fees, perhaps in accordance with the fee in the international mail, where there is a provision of this kind.

Mr. PATTERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY. I yield.

Mr. PATTERSON. Does the gentleman think it would be well to leave this to the Postmaster General, in view of his enthusiasm in raising revenue at this time? Does the gentleman think it would be well to risk that entirely to his discretion?

Mr. KELLY. We have had this bill up once before in the House and in order to be perfectly fair I agreed then to accept an amendment making the fee 5 cents.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Will the gentleman accept an amendment that he can prescribe for such services an increase not exceeding 5 cents?

Mr. KELLY. I shall offer an amendment myself if no one else does that the fee shall not exceed 5 cents for such service.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. STAFFORD. I know that inquiry should be limited to the bill; but if no further inquiry is to be made on the bill itself the committee would be interested in knowing more specifically as to the reason for the deficits in the respective services the gentleman has referred to. He cited certain figures—one where the indemnification service had caused a loss of a million dollars. Will the gentleman repeat the figures and specify the services where these large sums have been lost?

Mr. KELLY. I want to say that the authority is the Third Assistant Postmaster General, and the registry service has lost \$7,213,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is the basic reason for such a large deficit in that service?

Mr. KELLY. Simply because the expense of handling it is greater than the income derived from it.

The collect-on-delivery loss is \$4,225,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is for the benefit of the merchandizing firms.

Mr. KELLY. And there is no excuse for the loss of a penny on such a service; yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Has the department made any recommendation to cure that?

Mr. KELLY. The department is preparing—

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, preparing. The department takes a great deal of time in pointing out to the country that one reason for the large deficit in the Postal Service is the fact that it carries frankable mail, when, as a matter of fact, the cost for that service is less than a million dollars.

Mr. KELLY. That is true.

Mr. STAFFORD. Here is an instance where the department has performed services for merchandizing firms and yet they have not come before the committee and made any recommendation for increasing the rate.

Mr. KELLY. The department could not well make any recommendation on one service without making them on all.

Mr. STAFFORD. Why not; we have just raised the rate on registered mail.

Mr. KELLY. These different services are interlocked, and should be considered as a whole.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, this service for the merchandizing firms is not related; it is independent.

Mr. KELLY. Now, the loss on the money-order service is \$10,432,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is that loss traceable to the issuing of money orders for small or large amounts?

Mr. KELLY. That is the total for the money-order service.

Mr. STAFFORD. I wish to inquire whether it is because the rates are not sufficiently compensatory for the issuance of small or the issuance of large money orders.

Mr. KELLY. That has not been segregated. This is the total loss of the money-order service.

Mr. PATTERSON. We seem to be coming in with these little bits at a time, and is this necessary and essential? Is it going to accomplish the purpose of the gentleman to help Mr. Brown get his department out even? Let me go back to the widow mentioned by the gentleman from New York, who makes an inquiry. She will come in and make an inquiry at the post office about some registered mail that she has sent, and in the course of time the clerk will look it up and come back and say, "Five cents, please." You can imagine how the woman will feel. Probably she will not have a nickel with her at this time. This will not accomplish much to amount to anything. Why does not the gentleman wait and get his program made out, by which he is going to try to raise the postage receipts, and have it all at one time and let this House pass upon its merits?

Mr. KELLY. The gentleman knows that the deficit in the postal department is due in part to service not compensated for at all, and these unnecessary inquiries cost a considerable amount of money. The old lady who seems to have the gentleman's commiseration to such a degree will be told that this inquiry will cost her so much—2 or 3 cents or 5 cents—and she will know whether it is worth while to pay it.

Mr. PATTERSON. And the clerk will continue to lean on his arms right there at the window and will not move a step toward going and looking up for her because she does not want to spend 5 cents. I oppose this and other similar measures.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Is the committee also considering at this time a charge for a citizen who walks into the post office and asks what time it is?

Mr. KELLY. Oh, the gentleman is now sarcastic and facetious. We are giving millions of dollars of service without any charge at all.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I know, and the post office is the most popular department now, and I don't want to make it odious by these petty charges. Does not the gentleman believe that the mailer of a registered letter has a right to find out whether his letter has been delivered?

Mr. KELLY. He has the right if he pays 3 cents for a return card with a signature. He should not continue to come in and try to get the Post Office Department to keep an accounting department for him?

Mr. BOYLAN. Does not the gentleman think that this great era of efficiency which is sweeping over the Post Office Department, mulcting the people here and there and elsewhere, is going a little bit too far? Does the gentleman not think that with 2 cents for this receipt and 5 cents for looking in the directory, and I suppose you will be charged 25 cents if the clerk licks the stamp for you, and things of that sort, the very next bill we will have will be one putting a charge on one who writes a letter to the postmaster? Then, I suppose there will be an additional charge if you telephone to him.

Mr. PATTERSON. Oh, you need not say that. They do not keep a telephone now in places.

Mr. BOYLAN. Or if you go to the inquiry window and make an inquiry it will cost you 11 cents. Where is this thing going to stop? There is no end to it. The only thing that many of our people get free from the Government is a little bit of postal service. They get nothing else. Now you are going to make it so onerous for them that they will not be able to pay. A man registers a letter. In the ordinary course that letter should be delivered. But suppose the letter is not delivered, the department falls down. Then you have the inconceivable audacity to tell that man that he has got to pay a nickel to find out what became of his letter. The same is true with the money orders.

Mr. KELLY. The gentleman is not quite accurate. All the mail user has to do when he puts in a registered package

is to say that he desires a receipt from the addressee and pay 3 cents for it. He will then receive it.

Mr. BOYLAN. That is true, but how about the money orders?

Mr. KELLY. The same thing applies. He can get full information on that.

Mr. BOYLAN. Yes; but he has got to pay for it. If you go to a bank and draw a check and the check is not paid, the bank will find out where the check has gone without any cost.

Mr. KELLY. Does not the gentleman think that we are conservative with a \$10,000,000 reported loss on money orders, when we provide that a person who makes unnecessary inquiries, adding to costs, shall compensate for it in a small way?

Mr. BOYLAN. But who is to say whether it is necessary or unnecessary? It might be very necessary to the individual making the inquiry.

Mr. KELLY. That individual can get a receipt with all the information for a very small fee.

Mr. BOYLAN. You are making it more and more expensive for the public all the time.

Mr. KELLY. I do not disagree with the gentleman's philosophy entirely, but I also believe that there are some of these services costing so much more than we get in revenues where we are justified in getting a little more revenue in directions that will not injure the Postal Service.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Assume that a mailer asks for a return receipt and pays for it and he does not get his return receipt, then if he goes to the post office he has to pay an inquiry fee, a nickel, to find out why he does not get his return receipt, for which he has already paid.

Mr. KELLY. He will not. That mailer will not pay another fee. The organization of the Postal Service will be directed to getting that receipt back to the man who paid for it. We have an army of employees to get that information for him, and they get it, too.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. The bill reads:

That the Postmaster General is authorized to provide by regulation for making such inquiries as he may consider proper concerning registered, insured, or collect-on-delivery mail, upon the request of the sender or addressee thereof or his agent—

And so forth. Upon the payment of certain fees.

It seems to me that if he makes a proper inquiry to ascertain as to why he did not get his return receipt they will say, "Fill out this blank, pay a nickel, and we will tell you."

Mr. KELLY. This service is in force in the Foreign Mail Service, and there has never been anything but commendation for it. No such difficulties as that suggested have arisen.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Will the gentleman say it is not the intent of the House in passing this bill to charge for an inquiry concerning a return receipt for which the service has heretofore been paid?

Mr. KELLY. I will say that if the Post Office Department should undertake to charge for such inquiry as that it would be a violation of the purpose of this bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY. I yield.

Mr. STAFFORD. I notice the language is rather awkward. Of course, I will acquit the gentleman from Pennsylvania of authorship of this bill.

Mr. KELLY. The gentleman is very kind and flattering.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think the gentleman will agree that I am more than kind when I point out some of the awkward phraseology.

The Postmaster General is authorized to provide by regulation for making such inquiries—

What inquiries?—

as he may consider proper.

Mr. KELLY. As the Postmaster General may consider proper as the subject of charge.

Mr. STAFFORD (reading):

Such inquiries as he may consider proper.

The bill, as I look at it, refers to inquiries which the Postmaster General may make. He is authorized to provide for making such inquiry. That is, he is going to make some inquiry. It is very awkward phraseology.

Mr. KELLY. I agree with the gentleman. However, it was written in the Post Office Department, and it will carry out what is intended—that the Postmaster General may make regulations for the inquiries which are appropriate as the subject of charge.

Mr. PATTERSON. In other words, he wanted to emphasize always "the Postmaster General."

Mr. STAFFORD. This is not the first instance where some one in the department has been shown to be rather obtuse in his ability to express his ideas.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Postmaster General is authorized to provide by regulation for making such inquiries as he may consider proper concerning registered, insured, or collect-on-delivery mail upon the request of the sender or addressee thereof, or his agent, or concerning postal money orders upon request of the remitter, payee, indorsee, or his agent, and for the payment of such fees as he may prescribe for such service.

Mr. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KELLY: In line 9, after the word "of," strike out "such fees as he may prescribe" and insert in lieu thereof "a fee of not exceeding 5 cents."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition in opposition to the amendment.

What does this mean? As I say, I do not recall a bill that has been prepared in such wretched language as this to carry out the idea intended. I wish I had time to prepare a substitute to carry out the idea. This bill reads, "The Postmaster General is authorized," and so forth, "and for the payment of a fee of not to exceed 5 cents." What does it mean? We do not want to make ourselves ridiculous by passing a bill that is incongruous.

Mr. KELLY. It means that in no case shall he prescribe a fee of more than 5 cents.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, that does not carry out the idea of the gentleman. Let us analyze it from a critical standpoint. "The Postmaster General is authorized to provide by regulation," and so forth, "for the payment of a fee not exceeding 5 cents."

Mr. KELLY. "For such service."

Mr. STAFFORD. That was not included in the amendment offered by the gentleman.

Mr. KELLY. Yes; I left those words in.

Mr. STAFFORD. I beg your pardon. May the amendment be again reported?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will again report the amendment.

The Clerk read the amendment, as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KELLY: In line 9, after the word "of," strike out "such fees as he may prescribe" and insert in lieu thereof "a fee of not exceeding 5 cents."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SANDERS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to, and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HOCH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5659) to authorize the Postmaster General to charge a fee for inquiries made for patrons concerning registered, insured, or collect-on-delivery mail and for postal money orders, had directed him to report the same back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that

the amendment be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. SANDERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendment to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I move to recommit the bill to the Committee on Post Office and Post Roads.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I am.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LA GUARDIA moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York to recommit the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LA GUARDIA) there were—ayes 10 and noes 37.

So, the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—BATTLEFIELDS IN THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of the act of Congress approved June 11, 1926, entitled "An act to provide for the study and investigation of battlefields in the United States for commemorative purposes," I am transmitting a communication from the Secretary of War giving a detailed report of progress made under said act, together with his recommendations for further operations.

HERBERT HOOVER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 10, 1930.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. J. Res. 211. Joint resolution for the relief of farmers in the drought and/or storm stricken areas of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1759. An act for the relief of Laura A. DePodesta;

H. R. 1825. An act for the relief of David McD. Shearer; and

H. R. 10198. An act to repeal obsolete statutes and to improve the United States Code.

The SPEAKER also announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 328. An act for the relief of Edward C. Dunlap.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1759. An act for the relief of Laura A. DePodesta;

H. R. 1825. An act for the relief of David McD. Shearer; and

H. R. 10198. An act to repeal obsolete statutes and to improve the United States Code.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is no quorum present.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SANDERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, December 11, 1930, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Thursday, December 11, 1930, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

(10.30 a. m.)

War Department appropriation bill.

State, Justice, Commerce, and Labor Departments appropriation bill.

JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL REVENUE TAXATION

(10 a. m., room 321, House Office Building)

To consider depletion of mines.

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

(11 a. m.)

To authorize the construction of certain naval vessels (H. R. 14638).

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

(10 a. m.)

To enable the Secretary of the Treasury to expedite work on the Federal building program authorized by the act of Congress entitled "An act to provide for the construction of certain public buildings, and for other purposes," approved May 25, 1926, and acts amendatory thereof (H. R. 14041).

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

695. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copy of a letter from the Commissioner of the General Land Office, dated December 8, 1930, transmitting report of the withdrawals and restorations contemplated by the statute; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

696. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a bill for the relief of Dr. M. M. Brayshaw, of Loma Linda, Calif.; to the Committee on Claims.

697. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a bill to repeal certain obsolete parts of statutes relating to the strength of detachments at the United States Military Academy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

698. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a bill to authorize funds for the construction of a building on Government-owned land in the Canal Zone to house the radio-transmitter equipment of Albrook Field and France Field; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

699. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a deficiency estimate of appropriation pertaining to the legislative establishment, House of Representatives, for the fiscal year 1925 to 1931, in the sum of \$816.68 (H. Doc. 676); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

700. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, on preliminary examination and survey of Indian River, Del.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. LEAVITT: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 13053. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept donations to or in behalf of institutions conducted for the benefit of Indians; without amendment (Rept. No. 2088). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LEAVITT: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 12871. A bill providing for the sale of isolated tracts in the former Crow Indian Reservation, Mont.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2091). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HILL of Alabama: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 14266. A bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to lend to the Governor of Alabama 250 pyramidal tents, complete; fifteen 16 by 80 by 40 foot assembly tents; thirty 11 by 50 by 15 foot hospital-ward tents; 10,000 blankets, olive drab, No. 4; 5,000 pillowcases; 5,000 canvas cots; 5,000 cotton pillows; 5,000 bed sacks; 10,000 bed sheets; 20 field ranges, No. 1; 10 field bake ovens; 50 water bags (for ice water); to be used at the encampment of the United Confederate Veterans, to be held at Montgomery, Ala., in June, 1931; without amendment (Rept. No. 2092). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. BUTLER: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 2339. A bill for the relief of Ivan H. McCormack; without amendment (Rept. No. 2087). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COCHRAN of Pennsylvania: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 5792. A bill for the relief of Walter Goulette; with amendment (Rept. No. 2089). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GARRETT: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 6935. A bill for the relief of Ira N. Saffell; with amendment (Rept. No. 2090). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13295) granting a pension to Mary M. Carr, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LINDSAY: A bill (H. R. 14906) to purchase a site for the erection of a post-office building in the section of the Borough of Brooklyn, city of New York, N. Y., known as Greenpoint; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. PATTERSON: A bill (H. R. 14907) providing for building of public buildings in the different cities and towns of the United States; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BACON: A bill (H. R. 14908) to amend the act reclassifying the salaries of postmasters and employees of the Postal Service, readjusting their salaries and compensation on an equitable basis, increasing postal rates to provide for such readjustments; and other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 14909) to add certain lands to the Modoc National Forest, in the State of California; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. EVANS of Montana: A bill (H. R. 14910) to provide for the payment to veterans of the face value of their adjusted-service certificates on and after March 1, 1931; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CORNING: A bill (H. R. 14911) to provide for the construction of a vessel for the Coast Guard designed for ice breaking and assistance work; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JAMES of Michigan (by request of the War Department): A bill (H. R. 14912) to authorize an appropriation for construction at Randolph Field, San Antonio, Tex., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOORE of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 14913) to amend an act approved February 24, 1925, entitled "An act to provide for the construction of a memorial bridge across the Potomac River from a point near the Lincoln Memorial, in the city of Washington, to an appropriate point in the State of Virginia, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: A bill (H. R. 14914) for postal employees' longevity; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 14915) to authorize appropriations for construction at Hensley Field, Grand Prairie, Tex., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 14916) for the relief of the Uncompahgre reclamation project, Colorado; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. WELCH of California: A bill (H. R. 14917) to amend section 19 of the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14918) to amend section 200 of the World War veterans' act, as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. BURDICK: A bill (H. R. 14919) to amend the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. McSWAIN: A bill (H. R. 14920) to authorize the leasing of the Muscle Shoals property upon certain terms and conditions, to provide for the national defense, and for the regulation of interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOGG of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 14921) to provide for the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of an addition to the Federal building at Huntington, W. Va.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 14922) to amend the acts approved March 3, 1925, and July 3, 1926, known as the District of Columbia traffic acts, and so forth; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HARTLEY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 430) declaring Armistice Day to be a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOYLAN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 431) to consult the people upon the question of retaining or repealing the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLGOOD: A bill (H. R. 14923) granting an increase of pension to John A. Shannon; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14924) granting a pension to Estelle Foster; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ARNOLD: A bill (H. R. 14925) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Hunter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BACHARACH: A bill (H. R. 14926) granting a pension to Ida May Forbes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BAIRD: A bill (H. R. 14927) awarding a medal of honor to Henry G. Mehling; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BARBOUR: A bill (H. R. 14928) granting a pension to Stephen D. Graves; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BLOOM: A bill (H. R. 14929) to extend the benefits of the employees' compensation act of September 7, 1916, to Mary Elizabeth O'Brien, a former employee of the United States Veterans' Bureau; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BRITTEN: A bill (H. R. 14930) for the relief of Dr. M. M. Brayshaw; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CABLE: A bill (H. R. 14931) granting an increase of pension to Cecelia A. Burns; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14932) for the relief of John Otto Albright; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CANFIELD: A bill (H. R. 14933) granting an increase of pension to Margaret McElfresh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14934) granting a pension to Josie Slessly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARTER of California: A bill (H. R. 14935) for the relief of Joshua L. Bach; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14936) extending the benefits of the emergency officers' retirement act to Harry C. Boyden; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. CHIPERFIELD: A bill (H. R. 14937) for the relief of Abraham Lincoln Harper; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CONNOLLY: A bill (H. R. 14938) granting a pension to Charles J. Bradley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DEMPSEY: A bill (H. R. 14939) granting a pension to Adele Yates Taylor; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DORSEY: A bill (H. R. 14940) granting an increase of pension to Mary F. Wells; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 14941) granting a pension to Harvey Ledbetter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HANCOCK of New York: A bill (H. R. 14942) granting a pension to Ellen B. Stewart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14943) granting an increase of pension to Caroline Appelt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14944) granting an increase of pension to Rachel A. Booth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOFFMAN: A bill (H. R. 14945) for the relief of Joseph Silverman and Samuel Silverman, copartners, trading as Star Trading Co.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 14946) granting an increase of pension to Adaline Roberts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14947) granting a pension to Cora Turner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 14948) for the relief of Emma Shelly; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14949) for the relief of Rosamond B. McManus; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 14950) granting an increase of pension to Cora Kaylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14951) granting a pension to William Blair; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14952) granting a pension to Minnie J. Miles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14953) granting a pension to Ellen J. Owens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 14954) granting an increase of pension to Charles L. Shaeffer; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LUDLOW: A bill (H. R. 14955) granting an increase of pension to Lulu K. Stout; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14956) granting an increase of pension to Anna S. Duffner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McFADDEN: A bill (H. R. 14957) granting an increase of pension to Alice Phelps; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14958) granting an increase of pension to Isabelle Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14959) granting a pension to Christina M. Rockwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOUSER: A bill (H. R. 14960) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Simpson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14961) granting an increase of pension to Allie E. Fleming; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14962) granting an increase of pension to Sara P. Bowen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PARKER: A bill (H. R. 14963) granting a pension to John Charles Inglee; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mrs. RUTH PRATT: A bill (H. R. 14964) authorizing the President of the United States to posthumously present in the name of the Congress a congressional medal of honor to Lieut. Wilbert W. White, jr.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PURNELL: A bill (H. R. 14965) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Mitchell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REECE: A bill (H. R. 14966) granting a pension to Radah Stout; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHREVE: A bill (H. R. 14967) granting a pension to Marie Geiger; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14968) granting an increase of pension to Ameliza Drake; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SOMERS of New York: A bill (H. R. 14969) granting an increase of pension to Deborah J. Harris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPEAKS: A bill (H. R. 14970) granting an increase of pension to Eliza J. Bowers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14971) granting an increase of pension to Amelia Ann Keith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STRONG of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 14972) granting an increase of pension to John O. Lind; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 14973) granting an increase of pension to Hannah L. Bliler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWING: A bill (H. R. 14974) for the relief of Mrs. E. L. Babcock, mother and guardian of Nelson Babcock, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TABER: A bill (H. R. 14975) granting an increase of pension to Clarinda J. Gannon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14976) granting an increase of pension to Oraetta Bloomfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14977) granting an increase of pension to C. Victoria Northrup; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14978) granting an increase of pension to Mary Lamphere; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14979) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Mills; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14980) granting a pension to Lewis E. Gardner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 14981) granting a pension to Harvey E. Rodgers; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14982) granting a pension to Jesse Carl Arnold; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THATCHER: A bill (H. R. 14983) for the relief of William Hill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THURSTON: A bill (H. R. 14984) granting an increase of pension to Susan Boardman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14985) granting an increase of pension to Louisa M. Tuttle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TILSON: A bill (H. R. 14986) granting a pension to Hattie M. Hartshorn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TUCKER: A bill (H. R. 14987) authorizing the President to order William H. Sage, jr., before a retiring

board for a hearing of his case, and upon the findings of such board determine whether or not he be placed on the retired list with the rank and pay held by him at the time of his resignation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WELCH of California: A bill (H. R. 14988) for the relief of David and Edith Stadtner; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WOLVERTON of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 14989) granting an increase of pension to Annie A. Money-penny; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14990) granting a pension to Lloyd Shaver; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred, as follows:

7856. By Mr. ALDRICH: Petition of 23 voters in second congressional district of Rhode Island, urging passage of House bill 7884, a bill for the exemption of dogs from vivisection in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

7857. By Mr. BARBOUR: Resolutions of Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Visalia and Earlimart, Calif., urging Federal supervision of motion pictures; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7858. By Mr. BLOOM: Petition of the members of the International Conference for the Investigation of Vivisection, urging the passage of House bill 7884 promptly and without amendment; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

7859. By Mr. BRUMM: Petition of evidence in support of House bill 14829, granting a pension to Maria C. Gallagher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7860. By Mr. CANNON: Petition of veterans of the World War residing at Wellsville, Mo., favoring legislation providing for immediate payment of World War adjusted-service compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7861. By Mr. HALL of Mississippi: Petition signed by J. W. Pittman and other citizens of Forrest County, Miss., urging favorable action on House bill 3722, authorizing an appropriation for cooperation with States granting old-age and disabled-persons pensions; to the Committee on Pensions.

7862. By Mr. HOOPER: Petition of evidence in support of House bill 14853 granting a pension to Harry M. Snow; to the Committee on Pensions.

7863. Also, petition of evidence in support of House bill 14852 granting a pension to Ellen J. Ludlow, and also evidence in support of House bill 14854 granting an increase of pension to Evvah A. Dickson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7864. By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana: Petition of numerous citizens of Terre Haute, Ind., for an amendment to the Constitution excluding unnaturalized aliens from the count of the population of the Nation for apportionment of congressional districts among the States; to the Committee on the Census.

7865. By Mr. HARCOURT J. PRATT: Petition of Mrs. W. A. Chandler, president of the Home Missionary Society and the Foreign Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church, of Liberty, Sullivan County, N. Y., and 65 members of the organization, praying for passage of House bill 9986; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7866. By Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania: Petition of ex-service men of Indiana County, Pa., favoring the immediate cash payment of adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7867. By Mr. WASON: Petition signed by 109 residents of the second congressional district of New Hampshire, favoring the enactment of legislation prohibiting experiments upon living dogs in the District of Columbia as set forth in House bill 7884; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.